

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

A MAGAZINE FOR A DEMOCRACY OF CONTENT

24

VOL. 6

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER 1955

Comments

The Hydrogen Bomb and British Politics

—An Interim Report

Ernst Zander

Peter Hanwell

Critical Revue on Doctor Faustus

—Prologue in The Heaven of Art

Erik Erikson

The Uses of Civil Defense

Robert Ilson

William J. Valley

Material and Documents

Levantine Insolence

Reply

E. N. Koussa

The Movement for Colonial Freedom and
the Self-Determination of Nations

Report on the Conference

Peter Hanwell

2/-

40 cents

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

No. 23

The Campaign Against Remilitarization
in Germany

Ernst Zander

Is the Fluorine Found in Some Waters
really "Natural" and "Organic" ? Leo Spira, M.D., Ph.D. (Med.)

Material and Documents

On the Cumulative Effects Produced
by Thermonuclear Explosions on the
Surface of the Globe

Charles-Noël Martin

Atomic Power Stations

Frederick Soddy

Correspondence

For all who read German, we recommend our sister publication

DINGE DER ZEIT

Contents of No. 17 recently published:

Rückblick auf die Kampagne gegen
die Remilitarisierung

Paul Brass

Der Fall Puerto Rico

Erik Erikson

Kritische Revue aus Doktor Faustus

Die Spitzel und die Grosse
Utopie

Frank Osstry

Gegen Spitzel Immun !

A. W. Troisdorf

Dokumente und Materialen

Schluss mit der Wasserstoffbombe !

Offener Brief an Ludwig Zimmerer

Price 2/-, 40 cents

DISCUSSION MEETINGS

Friends, supporters and persons interested in the various ideas presented in *Contemporary Issues* hold regular meetings in various cities and countries. Anybody who wishes to take part in such gatherings and discussions is asked to communicate with us at our London, New York or Johannesburg address.



V

C

T

C

T

M

Su

Pu

54

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

Vol. 6

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1955

NUMBER 24

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Comments, by Ernst Zander	238
The Hydrogen Bomb and British Politics—An Interim Report, by Peter Hanwell	245
Critical Revue on Doctor Faustus—Prologue in the Heaven of Art, by Erik Erikson	265
The Uses of Civil Defense, by Robert Ilson and William J. Valley	288
Material and Documents	
Levantine Insolence	291
Reply, by E. N. Koussa	293
The Movement for Colonial Freedom and the Self-Determination of Nations	295
Report on the Conference, by Peter Hanwell	297

Subscription rates are 12s. (\$2.40) per year, or 8s. (\$1.60) for four issues.

Published by Contemporary Press, 26 Heber Road, London, N.W.2,
545 Fifth Avenue, New York City, 17, N.Y., and P.O. Box 13,
Johannesburg, as a two-monthly.

COMMENTS

I. AGREEMENT, NOT UNION

UNDER the above title a certain Christian E. Lewalter wrote in *Die Zeit* (Hamburg) of 24th March, 1955:

"The 'Institute for European History' in Mainz is a research enterprise, not an institute for the preparation of a quick European integration. At its first international congress (March 16 to 20) there gathered therefore scholars not politicians . . . and the Europe movement still so soaring some years ago was only very occasionally mentioned. Was that resignation or realism?

"There was a critical moment in the discussion in which this question found an answer. The Cambridge historian Hinsley declared: 'Never has the existence of national states caused a war. Wars always came only when national states were unable to transgress the horizon of their own interests and to subordinate their will to the welfare of the whole'. This thesis of the superfluousness of a political integration was opposed by an American scholar, Professor Walker from Stanford. 'For the inhabitant of a state whose expanse is much greater than that of the whole of Europe it is difficult not to become impatient if he sees how slowly Europe unites itself.'

"This congress, uncommon because of the number of its participants, its manysidedness and intellectual rank, was thus, as said Martin Göhring, director of the Mainz institute, who called and organized it, 'a European congress, but not a Europe-congress'. It should look for an agreement on what one can call 'the European' and ask what inducements and necessities exist for a 'European consciousness' which detaches itself from non-European cultures, from the Soviet-system and — perhaps — also from Americanism, and feels itself unconvertible. Four days long was this central question illuminated from all sides, not in academic composedness but with the intensity which one applies to decisive questions."

The European congress has thus confirmed what has been said in this periodical about the Europe-movement still so "soaring" some years ago: that it was on the part of statesmen like Churchill simply reactionary swindle, and on the part of the other participants in the best case only ideological confusion. But, for what concerns the "uncommon" intellectual rank of this congress, it is right from the beginning characterized as uncommonly *low* by the Cambridge historian who with exactly the same sense and understanding could have said: "Never has the existence of men caused a theft. Thefts always occurred only when men were unable to transgress the 'horizon' of their own sensation of hunger and to subordinate their will to eat to the welfare of the whole". Not less able in "history" is the American scholar who opposes such a "thesis" and almost becomes impatient because he inhabits a state with a much greater "expanse" and still does not understand that under the present economic system the unification of Europe can be just nothing else than explicit swindle or empty ideological tittle-tattle.

Now have at least the other participants of the congress produced more than pure babble about the alleged "decisive question" illuminated with intensity from all sides, and have they even in the remotest sense found out what "inducements and necessities" exist for a European consciousness which detaches itself — perhaps also from Americanism, and feels itself

as unconvertible? As is self-evident with inducements and necessities for a consciousness, the consciousness was the perfect image of the inducement and the necessity. For, according to Lewalter, what the *common* consists in, in which the "European nation" recognizes itself, has been most clearly [!] expressed by the Zürich philosopher of history Hans Barth:

"Common European is the recognition of the authority of the logos, the authority of natural right and the authority of the promise of a kingdom of God. But since the unlimited administration of these authorities cannot appertain to any single individual, the freedom of conscience for all is indispensable if these authorities shall not become compulsory powers. The European is in this perspective the attempt to find a balance between the claim of universality as is immanent in each of these imperatives and the right of the individual conscience which has to interpret them."

Lewalter is right: The "common" is "most clearly" expressed in these immortal statements, only it is not the common of Europe but the common "intellectual rank" of this incredible congress. We owe it to the authority of the logos, of the natural right and the promise of a kingdom of God that the philosopher of history is a Swiss, i.e. the inhabitant of a kingdom of God where one so to speak spontaneously intones the popular song: High on the mountain-pastures there is no sin! There on the mountain-pastures or at least in thinking of same (perhaps there was also involved a brown-spotted cow which had been felt as unconvertible!) has our brave philosopher, free from sin, not only (in particular) discovered the authority of the natural right, but also the common European "recognition" of it. And in order to make the "logos" a masterpiece this *recognized* authority (an "imperative" to boot) will also be *interpreted* by the individual conscience. Involuntarily comic, Lewalter rightfully remarks again:

"European is always ambiguous, because it stands in the tension between the universal and the individual. Therefore it became so difficult for the congress to define what 'Europe as a task' could be. . . . Words like 'tradition', 'preservation of the cultural values' or 'revival of the European spirit' are all entangled in this ambiguity and can no longer have splendour. But what is to be done since one cannot let things simply float?"

Since Lewalter poses the question of what is to be done publicly, and leaves it at that, it will here be answered:

1. Throw the whole ideological plunder of the congress on the ideological dust-heap and characterize it for what it is: Worn-out ideological bosh.*

2. Oppose especially the nonsense that "European stands in the tension between the universal and the individual". The same nonsense is not only told by ideologists all over the world, but also (whether he uses other words or not) by Mr. Eisenhower when he tries to define what is "American" and to explain America's "mission". Differently expressed: The tension between the so-called universal and the individual is but the ideological reflex of a real *social* tension which today has to be solved on a world scale. But nowhere needs this tension so much ideological embellishment as in the great capitalist countries where means and end (produc-

* According to Lewalter the congress has stated: "The recently still so often mentioned 'Europe-idea' is itself an ideology and had quickly been forced to share the fate of other ideologies." But since Lewalter himself is entangled in insipid ideology he does not see that his entire report and his concluding question is implicitly one great condemnation of the ideological babble which this congress communicated to the world.

tion on the one hand and satisfaction of human needs on the other) fall completely apart and create the insanity which appears as a supra-natural power and under which in reality suffer not only "individuals" but all people on earth: Production for profit or (put into the formula alienated from the end and fixing the "tension") production for the sake of production.

3. Enlighten the public, consequently, about the insane contradiction that bourgeois society, Russia included, threatens to blow itself up into the air, because the wealth it produces can no longer be utilized for the sake of profit (regardless of whether the state or individuals intend to cash it) and must therefore on an ever greater scale be "laid still" or directly destroyed. Here is an enormous amount of indeed not ideological but theoretical-critical or (since the word is so much liked) truly *spiritual* work to do, the honestly avowed aim of which must be to organize the opposition against the insanity and to eliminate the profit-system. For what "European" is can only come to light if all countries can freely develop after the elimination of the mechanizing-totalitarian effects of the rotting capitalist system (most advanced in Russia and America) with the elimination of this system itself. Much is in any case already gained if one ceases to talk, write and spread around dry nonsense.

2. THE POPE AND NUCLEAR ENERGY

Four years ago a Dutch theologian (Calvinist) asked me: "What do you think of the Pope's new dogma concerning the bodily ascension of the Virgin Mary?" We were not alone, but I shrugged my shoulders in truth for no other reason than the fact that the man was himself a dogmatic theologian (I'm always somewhat embarrassed when accomplices try to pick holes in each other's coats). Well, this theologian was not easily disconcerted and continued: "I think it is simply crazy". Now I answered: "Since you and the Pope are in the theological field equally infallible, I shall contradict neither you nor the Pope".

I remembered this incident when I found in American newspapers the Pope's Easter message under the comment-title: "Pope hails uses of atom in peace". It was immediately superclear: The religious part of the Pope's Easter message is of no concern — one has, besides, heard and read the same sentences several hundred thousand times already during childhood and the reference to the "true faith" which is the speciality of every sect was also not lacking. But what of the "peaceful application of nuclear energy" as is said in the comment of the *New York Times* of 11th April? There the Pope had evidently stepped into a field where his infallibility has not to be taken into account and where he can, like every mortal, be involved in a controversy. And thus it was — the Pope had engaged himself in such a doubtful matter as first, in particular, the construction of the American submarine *Nautilus* propelled by nuclear energy, and second the application of nuclear energy in general. The *New York Times* felt obliged to write:

"Unusual for an Easter message from St. Peter's balcony was the technical [!] detail with which Pius discussed the developments in the field of nuclear research. Carefully accenting every word, he underlined the rising importance of science for politics and hailed the peaceful application of nuclear energy. In his allusion to the U.S.S. *Nautilus* the Pope said: 'Without fear or trepidation we

have noted the recent advances which, after some definite progress, have successfully completed the first attempt to propel a ship by means of nuclear energy, at last putting that force to the service, and not to the destruction of men".

And the *Daily News* of 11th April wrote:

"In the most technical [!] and scientific [!] Easter message any Pontiff ever delivered, Pius XII surprised the half-million pilgrims jammed in St. Peter's Square by boldly tackling the moral problem of nuclear energy."

With or without the authority of the natural right (to contradict) it may be first of all stated that the Pope's message contains strictly speaking not one word which could be qualified as "technical detail" or as "technical" and "scientific". The little which the Pope has said at all with regard to the atom-question is a completely unscientific acceptance of nuclear energy in general terms on the one side, and a "warning" against possible dangers in general terms on the other. Both are in nothing, in absolutely nothing, distinguished from the cheapest general terms we find in the press — terms which are today already familiar to schoolboys and enable them to tackle the "moral problem of nuclear energy" no less "boldly" than the Pope himself, namely with the beautiful self-evidence befitting empty phrases without moral consequence. However, more important is the circumstance that the Pope's *warning* does not too well agree with his declaration that he has noted the recent advances in nuclear energy without "fear". One does not, if one means it seriously, warn, if one is not at least very worried, and the crux of the whole matter is from the *scientific* standpoint just that the so-called "peaceful" application of nuclear energy is not less dangerous and finally even no less catastrophic than its application to war. Scientists who still possess the moral — boldness to tell the truth have long arrived at the conclusion that the production of nuclear energy on any greater scale must end with the destruction of life on this earth, and so great are the difficulties created by the production of bombs hitherto, etc., that not even the problem of the perilous *wastes* has been solved (were it for instance to become possible to shoot these wastes into space the problem would by no means be "solved", but only new dangers would have been evoked).

One can only deal with what the Pope has said in public, not with what he may know, but what he has said is far removed from scientific insight. It is an outspoken amateurish praise of nuclear energy, and it requires more than that, more than an allusion to the *Nautilus* and a "warning" which ignores the consequences of the whole atom-business, already tangible at present, if one is to have "boldly" tackled the "moral problem" of nuclear energy. (By the way: the person who had the moral boldness to write such stuff for the *Daily News* is Eleanor Packard.) On the contrary, moral or immoral problem, as such it begins just there where the Pope — does not even touch it. There are, beside the "peaceful" *Nautilus*, the series of A- and H-bomb explosions against which for good reasons (destructive results which can be *scientifically* predicted and have empirically already been ascertained) protest not only millions of peoples (among them factually the whole population of Japan) but also scientists enjoying true authority. A man like Albert Schweitzer, for example, had the boldness (this time without quotation-marks) really to tackle the most burning moral and physical problem when he wrote to a scientist:

"If you and Alexander Haddow . . . can manage to persuade them [the scientists] to put before mankind the thoughts by which they themselves are obsessed, then there will be some hope of stopping these horrible explosions and of bringing pressure to bear on the men who govern."

Bringing pressure on those who govern is all the more the most noble duty of everybody who wants to tackle the "moral" problem, because these explosions have not only nothing to do with "peaceful" ends but also gravely violate international rights. What "natural right" have America, Russia, England to increase radioactivity, to "disturb" the weather, to spoil the harvests in other countries and so on? And what right has in particular the government of the United States (even if it would have the "natural right" to hurt America's inhabitants) to poison the ocean and to tell other people at what time they have to keep out of certain waters? The ocean and the animals living in it are not the property of the United States (if they should one day become its property we owe it like so many other blessings to the authority and "recognition" of the logos, the natural right and the kingdom of God!), and there would be a nice clash if other states were to permit themselves the same extravagances as the government of the United States.

One comes still closer to the "moral" problem if one looks at the "reasons" which induced the Pope to *exhort* "men of science and of good will to persevere bravely and confidently in their theoretical and experimental study of the instruments and the promising material". The only reasons appearing in the message are:

- (a) "to attain a worthwhile [!] production of easily accessible energy, which may be put to use where it is needed, and contribute to the lessening of the pressure of want and misery";
- (b) the work of the scientists (and men of "good will") "can render supreme service, human and moral as well as scientific";
- (c) studying "the effects which the numerous types of radiation now at our disposal have on plants, on their development, on their fruits and the possibility of preserving them" can "help resolve the food problems which are of such importance in the life of men".

The Pope has with these "mighty" reasons not "tackled" anything, but has with his public *exhortation* driven to the surface a whole series of technical, scientific and moral problems. Naturally: There is no objection to the theoretical and experimental *studies* as such — the problems arise only where by the *quantity of industrial production* (be it for bombs or for energy) the danger of a general poisoning becomes acute. And on this score the following has to be said against the "reasons" given by the Pope:

- (a) Concerning the production of easily accessible energy, there is not the slightest reason for exposing humanity even to the remote *possibility* of a danger, because the problem of energy has long been solved. The "moral" problem to be tackled here consists precisely in the circumstance that mankind could have much more energy than it needs (even without certain oil-products which are also highly problematical) but is by a totally irrational and *immoral* economic system prevented from obtaining it and therefore also from using it for the "lessening of the pressure of want and misery". With the authority belonging to us in *our* field (whether we have otherwise the "true" or untrue faith is without importance for the matter)

we therefore declare solemnly and give it as a message to the world: Nuclear energy would, under the present economic system, contribute *nothing* to the lessening of the pressure of want and misery, even if its "worthwhile" production presented no danger.

(b) It follows from this that under the present economic system the work of scientists and men of "good will" which the Pope has in mind *never* can render "supreme" *human and moral* service, but in the final effect only can lead to the human and moral ruin of society. Science and good will (which is only too often cheaper than egg-shells) standing *in the service of this system* are pretty generally a part of that force which always intends the good and in 99 per cent of cases always creates the bad, but science and good will which devote themselves to the production of nuclear bombs and energy create evil a full 100 per cent. The human and moral decay can consequently already be studied on the majority of the scientists who lose on one side under the pressure of state and economy the connection with other sciences and with the general human interest of the whole of society, and lose on the other side, in fear for their positions, in fear of state-reprisals and the destruction of their career, the *moral* courage to tell the truth which they know. Again Albert Schweitzer and not the Pope (as Eleanor Packard "boldly" asserts) tackles the moral problem in writing:

"It must be the scientists [!], who comprehend thoroughly all the issues and the dangers involved, who speak to the world, as many [!] as possible of them, all telling humanity the truth [!] in speeches and articles. If they all [!] raised their voices, each one feeling himself impelled to tell the terrible truth, they would be listened to, for then humanity would understand that the issues were grave. . . . But the scientists must speak up. Only they have the authority to state that we can no longer take on ourselves the responsibility for these experiments; only they can say it."

It stands extremely badly for the human and moral services which the work of scientists and men of good will can render if the latter either do not feel impelled to tell the *truth* or repress their feeling out of cowardice.

(c) Concerning the solution of food problems the case is exactly the same as with the problem of energy, first because radiation (especially for the purpose of preservation) lowers the natural value of the food and is dangerous, and second because the food problem too is already solved in a much better way, or could be solved without great pain if the present economic system did not prevent the nourishment of humanity in precisely the same way as it prevents the provision of energy. The "moral" problem to be tackled is best illuminated by the problem of the so-called agricultural *surpluses* which the government buys and stores with the money of the tax-payers and then lets rot or destroys in order to keep food prices (as the *Daily News* of 19th April says) *too* high. If there is otherwise a shortage it can easily be overcome. Beside the enormous values wasted and destroyed to the *detriment* of humanity in A- and H-bombs ("research", production and experiments) an AP-dispatch of 17th April informs us from Washington:

"The *Hoover* commission told Congress today the government is wasting billions of dollars by piling up 'mountainous' supplies of unneeded [!] goods and then selling them as surplus at a fraction of the cost [5 to 7 per cent of the latter]."

In question are supplies valued at 155 billion dollars — not including stockpiled "strategic materials" and the food "surpluses". We are willing

to prove to Eleanor Packard that the same waste reigns in every field of government activity, that those *alone* who work must pay for it, and that even poor Italy could in a short time nourish its population brilliantly and provide it with everything necessary if the men who govern it would decide to *practice* their "good will" instead of speaking about it. For the time being the atom-business has led to the sad fact that fishermen searching for food turn back home with poisoned fish and have themselves become victims of a "source of energy" which can never be taken into account for "peaceful" ends. Viewed from the moral standpoint the Easter message of the Pope has the rather heavy defect of hailing nuclear energy but not even mentioning the ravages and victims resulting from it so far.

3. THE "REALISTIC" NUCLEAR PERSPECTIVE

That the men who govern literally don't know any more in what way to waste is shown in an article by Richard B. Lyman in the *N.Y. Herald-Tribune* of 19th April which also throws a brilliant light on the "realistic" necessities and expectations connected with the nuclear business.

According to Lyman "plans to preserve the inimitable pattern of Manhattan and New York's other four boroughs, even after an atomic war, were put into effect yesterday" by means of micro-filming "the records of about 845,000 parcels of real estate property . . . as a protective civil defense measure".

"Survivors, if any [this flower as a present to the whole world!], are not committed to erect a greater and better dream city on the ashes of the old [especially not a "better" one since the old is really an unsurpassable "dream"!]. Instead, they will be able to dig out the film records and recreate, as far as money and persons will allow [this flower too belongs to the whole world!], the historic grid pattern designed for a city served by river transportation. And the taxicabs, which almost certainly will survive [great heavens!], can be counted upon to bring back the old familiar traffic jams [about these jams and the extremely healthy gasoline stink connected with it we are, if possible, still more crazy than about the old "dream" city]. Best of all, lot lines could be re-established without dispute to parts of an inch".

The program is being undertaken "to protect the citizens of New York City, according to Dr. Luther A. Gulick, City Administrator" who said:

"Should an enemy atomic bomb fall on Manhattan or on any of the four boroughs, nothing but chaos would follow in attempting to prove ownership or equity to property, if the records were destroyed. The duplication of these documents on microfilm is therefore a realistic necessity, especially in large cities."

According to John K. Boeing, president of the Recordak Corp., approximately eighteen months will be required to finish the work. It is all the more a "realistic necessity" the less we know whether there will be, with the exception of the taxicabs — any survivors. Those who at present still live and use their heads can only say: As far as money will allow, certain persons and governments will allow themselves to "solve" the food problems which are of such importance in the life of men in this happy way too. For themselves, of course, because it keeps the system "going" by sheer waste, and in this happy way, because it is again connected with nuclear energy which serves as a pretext for the waste.

Peter Hanwell

THE HYDROGEN BOMB AND BRITISH POLITICS — An Interim Report

ON the 10th March,* Sir Richard Acland, in protest against the decision of the British Government to manufacture the Hydrogen Bomb, and to create the means for delivering it, resigned his seat as Labour Member of Parliament for Gravesend, in order, as he stated in his speech of resignation, to "test out what the electors feel about it". In the same speech he asserted:

"At this time, when many little people are bewildered by the fact that both the leading parties have accepted this horror . . . somebody must go to the limits of what is possible within the framework of democracy. I should not be true to myself if I did anything other than that." (*Manchester Guardian*, 11th March.)

This courageous act was the adequate response of an elected representative of the people to a deeply felt need, a need expressed in a letter by Ianthe Carswell to the *Manchester Guardian* (28th February):

"Sir — You have published several letters with powerful arguments against the manufacture of Hydrogen Bombs in this country, and other major newspapers have published similar letters. I am very glad that the opposition seems so widespread, and I personally have not yet met anybody in favour of this decision. But in spite of this, the opposition does not seem to be represented in Parliament, and I should like to know whether any attempt is being made to organise it so that it may be appreciated by the Government."

Under these circumstances, Sir Richard Acland's resignation introduced a welcome breath of fresh air into the close, unprincipled atmosphere of British politics. Anthony Howard, President of the Oxford Union Society, writing in a letter to *The Times* on 23rd March stated:

"Anyone in touch with young political opinion . . . (knows) that to most of us Sir Richard Acland's gesture is the most significant private political action since the war. It reveals to some of us what we previously doubted — that both integrity and intelligence can exist in politics today."

The public response to Sir Richard Acland was immediate and unequivocal, and the public feeling was expressed in many letters appearing in the correspondence columns of the press, a sure sign that the editors were receiving far more of them than they chose to print. The following two are representative:

"To the Editor of *The Manchester Guardian*.

Sir, — Sir Richard Acland deserves congratulations for his magnificent stand. His action will receive support from every part of the country among people of all parties and none. Is this not the action that so many of your recent correspondents will welcome? Certainly the resultant by-election will give an indication of the large number of people who oppose the manufacture of the H-Bomb in Britain. — Yours, etc.,

Edward W. Corby."

* All dates, unless otherwise stated, refer to 1955, and all italics are the author's.

"To the Editor of the *Times*.

Sir, — My heart was gladdened to see the two letters in yesterday's issue of the *Times* applauding Sir Richard Acland's resignation. In my view, his action was a supreme example of Christian courage and in a mad world may be the spark that will set us on the road to sanity. Although I am immersed in the cares of running a business and bringing up a family I have written to Sir Richard Acland offering to help in the forthcoming by-election. Yours faithfully, H. Brooke."

That this last correspondent is not alone in his choice is evidenced by the following extract from a letter from Sir Richard Acland in response to just such an offer:

"Please envisage an overtaxed election staff struggling to sort out a torrent of offered assistance. . . ."

The varied nature of the support received by Sir Richard Acland truly indicated that here was an issue which transcended all party politics and sectional affiliations. According to a report in the *Manchester Guardian* (14th March):

"Prayers were said at Thaxted Parish Church, Essex, yesterday for Sir Richard Acland. . . ."

The Vicar, the Rev. J. Putterill, said: 'We must all pray for Sir Richard in his great fight against the Hydrogen Bomb. Let the Church speak out boldly against this very great evil.'

and in the correspondence columns of the *Times* (14th March):

"Sir: May I be allowed, as a very old and extremely unimportant Conservative to express my great admiration of Sir Richard Acland's decision. . . ."

The question of the manufacture of atomic bombs appears to me to transcend all party politics. . . ."

while a report in the *Manchester Guardian* (12th March) informs us:

"At Northfleet, one of the four local parties that constitute the Gravesend Constituency Labour Party responded unanimously to Sir Richard Acland's statement as soon as it arrived [and, no doubt, before the Labour Party Whip had a chance to get cracking — P.H.]. A resolution said: This party supports the stand of their member, Richard Acland, on the issue of the British production and use of the H-Bomb, and urges him to continue this line of Sanity as the only hope of survival for Britain."

The *unanimous* disaffection of a local constituency party undoubtedly reflects the widespread dissatisfaction felt throughout the membership of the Labour Party with the official policy of its leadership (if the stream of nonsense to which this leadership has subjected them can be dignified with the name of a policy), while the spontaneous gravitation of people in all sections of the community towards Sir Richard Acland indicates the definite existence of deep oppositional currents throughout the whole of the British people, an opposition ranging from religious organizations and individuals,¹ to the machinery of party politics itself. In view of the impor-

¹ The split between "officialdom" and "membership" characteristic of bureaucratic institutions is very much in evidence with regard to the Anglican Church. Thus the Archbishops of Canterbury and York sanctify the Bomb with their official blessing and approve its manufacture while many members of the "rank and file" (the lower ranks of the clergy and the laity) raise a storm of protest. The behaviour of the Nonconformists was, in contrast, thoroughly sound and clear. According to a report in the *Manchester Guardian* (14th March):

"The General Assembly of Unitarian and Free Christian Churches in Liverpool yesterday, condemned the manufacture and use of 'this horrible weapon, the Hydrogen Bomb'. . . . The Rev. Mrs. Elspeth Vallance said: . . . 'It is hypocrisy for the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to sing "Sufficient is Thine Arm Alone" and add under their breath "as long as we have the Hydrogen Bomb".'"

tance of this issue, it is not unfair to say that Sir Richard Acland has been treated to a conspiracy of silence on the whole matter, and the occasion for by-passing the compulsion to acknowledge this opposition as well as to comment publicly on Sir Richard Acland's resignation was presented to both Government and Opposition alike in the form of one gigantic red herring, which the press has spared no opportunity of drawing across the path of real politics in Britain, in the person of the official opposition of the official opposition — Mr. Aneurin Bevan.

Mr. Bevan has had ample opportunity for demonstrating his talents for blowing hot and cold on issues which are tending to concentrate public dissatisfaction, opportunities which both he and the Labour Party have in the past been quick to seize. The most outstanding example in the past was his "opposition" to the rearmament programme, in response to widespread public oppositional currents, an opposition in which Mr. Bevan proved his only interest to be that of taming it for Party purposes by canalizing it through the creation of a so-called "Bevanite" faction in the Labour Party, and almost immediately inviting the public to abandon it "in the interests of Party unity".² It is indeed ironic to observe this great disarmer of yester-year now standing up in Parliament and criticizing the Government for "the failure to provide [food? . . . houses? . . . clothing? . . . — not a bit of it, but] weapons"! (*Hansard*, 2nd March); and Mr. Bevan's performance throughout this whole business should at least have had the merit of dispelling all illusions as to the possibility of his assuming any sort of real oppositional leadership.

The offence, about which there was such a hue and cry in the British Press, amounted to nothing more than this: that Mr. Bevan requested of Mr. Attlee in Parliament that he publicly give the precise meaning of the opposition amendment to the Government's resolution approving the White Paper announcing the manufacture of the Hydrogen Bomb, *not, it must be noted, in relation to the manufacture of the bomb, which the amendment specifically approves*, but only in relation to its use in some possible future war. The political issue of such tremendous importance thus was, that since Mr. Bevan had asked in public a question which he could quite easily have asked in private, "therefore" he was defying the authority of the leader of the Opposition, embarrassing the Party, splitting the Labour Movement, and even possibly — horror upon horror — impairing the possibility of Labour's being returned at the next election.

And in contrast to the Archbishop of York's "agonizing challenge to conscience", (the compromise between principles and expediency is always *agonizing* to those who make principles their *business*, but somehow they seem to survive!) we have the unequivocal statement of the President of the Methodist Conference, The Rev. W. Russell Shearer (*Times*, 17th March):

"Christians have every right to proclaim that the use of the hydrogen bomb is completely indefensible and *have no right to maintain silence*. We cannot commit ourselves to a diabolical form of destruction which aims at that final blasphemy, the blotting out of the human race. . . . Christian people are *in duty bound* to voice their conviction that it is totally wrong to use it."

² For a comment on the Bevan question and rearmament, see the election leaflet — *For Election Boycott Against Rearmament*, published by Contemporary Press, 1951.

Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, M.P., and a member of the Labour Party's "shadow cabinet", stated in a speech at Doncaster (*Manchester Guardian*, 14th March):

"I did not intend to refer to the matters which will be discussed privately by the Parliamentary Labour Party next Wednesday, but in view of statements made I will say just this. *We shall not be concerned at that meeting with questions of policy.* We shall be concerned with the standards of loyalty to be expected from ourselves — the Labour members of Parliament — to Party decision, to the leader of the Party, and to one another. . . . In the House of Commons Mr. Attlee was subjected to a hostile interrogation in language which might have come from the leader of another party rather than from one of his own loyal supporters. There was even an implied threat that if his answers were unsatisfactory another lead would have to be provided. I do not see how this sort of thing can possibly be regarded as anything else but a direct challenge to the elected leader of our Party and therefore an affront to the party itself which elected him."

while Mr. G. A. Brown, M.P., speaking at Belper poured forth the misery known only to the bureaucrat who sees his job threatened (*Manchester Guardian*, 7th March):

"Unless we show a much greater sense of unity and courage, the party will find that the electors will not take seriously our claim to be the alternative Government."

Enough to make any party call emergency meetings, propose votes of censure, withdraw the party whip, threaten to expel, withdraw the threat to expel, and call for assurances that the offending member would be a good boy in future. This music-hall turn, which passes for official politics in Britain, would be laughable enough if it were not for the avid way in which it was pounced upon by politicians, press, *et al.*, as a vehicle for exercising the tremendous British talent for mixing everything up and attempting to confuse the public, a repercussion which seriously calls into question the accidentality of the whole business in the first place.

Clearly the real issue at stake is not Mr. Attlee's authority within the Labour Party, but the question of the Hydrogen Bomb, and on this issue, Mr. Bevan clearly endorsed the official policy. He stated (*Hansard*, 2nd March):

"I cannot myself see that there is any logical difference between the Hydrogen Bomb and the Atom Bomb. Nor indeed can I see any difference, except scientifically and technically, between the two of them and saturation bombing, which is also indiscriminate slaughter of human beings. They are all immoral. So I am not going to take up my stand on saying that I am for the Atom Bomb and not for the Hydrogen Bomb."

This statement should be directly contrasted with the behaviour of Sir Richard Acland, who said (*Hansard*, 10th March):

"I have sinned in regard to this issue. I should have protested, or protested much more vigorously, not merely against the H-Bomb today, but against the A-Bomb, and the strategic bomber force each year this matter came forward since the war."

The inference should be obvious even to Mr. Bevan. If one wishes to be both logical and moral in politics, "all" one has to do is to acknowledge one's mistakes, resign one's seat in Parliament, and go to the public on the matter. Confessing oneself immoral in no way excuses the deed, and Sir Richard Acland felt himself constrained to dissociate himself from Mr. Bevan in no uncertain manner. Speaking at a press conference he stated (*Manchester Guardian*, 11th March):

"I think the situation has been made more confused by the initiative of Aneurin Bevan, which has been widely taken in public as opposition to the manufacture of the H-Bomb, but which is nothing of the sort. He is in favour of manufacture but only has doubts about the nature of using it. That is taking up a position which seems to me to be untenable."

Mr. Bevan's position becomes even more suspect in the light of a statement made by himself in an article printed in the *News Chronicle* of the 9th of March to the effect that:

"Since even the testing of the Hydrogen Bomb is laden with such menace for mankind, it is criminal for these tests to continue."

In the light of this insight, does this master "logician" demand that this criminal act cease forthwith and that Britain refrain from manufacturing the Bomb? Certainly not! Instead, intent on removing the whole matter from the sphere of public control, he merely shouts for a meeting of the atomic powers "if only for the limited object of agreeing to make no further tests", as if the great powers had not met and met for the last decade or more, as if each meeting had not been followed by some further disaster for mankind, and as if they were not in perfect agreement on matters affecting the destiny of humanity such as the Hydrogen Bomb. In any case, good will toward humanity on the part of the great powers is easily demonstrable by their simply ceasing to manufacture and test the wretched things, in which case there would be nothing for them to talk about — they could simply get on with the business of, for instance, housing, clothing, and feeding the world. Such an elementary proposition, however, can hardly be expected from the self-styled logical immoralist of British politics, who in the middle of the whole artificial schemozzle calmly issues a statement to the effect that:

"I wish to make it quite clear that what I have said or done is not a challenge to the authority or position of Mr. Attlee as leader of the Party. *Differences are on policy, and only policy.*" (*Manchester Guardian*, 12th March.)

Leaving aside the question (heavy political theory this) of how a request for clarification can turn itself into a difference of policy, the deliberate confusionism is transparent. By creating the appearance of difference where none exists, a smokescreen can be dropped over the real issues in an attempt to divert the attention of the public. According to the political correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* (11th March):

"The Bevanites' tactics [1] are to associate the attack on their leader with the question of the manufacture [1] of the Hydrogen Bomb."

The British public, however, are not so easily beguiled, and a letter to the *Evening Standard* (16th March) reads:

"I think most people, including myself, feel that the press are giving too much space to 'Bevan News'. G. Slater."

One thing, however, emerged with undeniable clarity from the Bevan "controversy", and that is, from the point of view of British politics as a whole, and apart from the competition, always rife, for the privilege of office, the complete identity of both Government and Opposition. An article in *Socialist Commentary*, described by the *Manchester Guardian* (4th April) as a "serious monthly . . . in a sort of independent middle-of-the-road position within the Labour Party", asks, and of course fails to answer the question: *"What are the Socialists working for that the Tories will not accept?"* What indeed? And in the body of the article, it is stated: "No-one knows what are the differences of principle that divide Bevan and his

supporters from the rest". On the question of the Hydrogen Bomb all this is particularly apparent, and while Sir Richard Acland could state that "the H-Bomb issue is right above normal party politics . . . [and] at all costs I had to bring this issue directly to the people" (*Manchester Guardian*, 11th April), the utmost concern, demagogery aside as we shall see, which the Labour Party could bring to bear on the matter was the complaint registered by Gordon Walker, M.P., that "members of the Labour Party who stirred up the maximum controversy over the H-Bomb were [doing their duty in bringing the issue to the public and promoting the maximum possible discussion? — No Sir, but] *weakening their party*". (*Manchester Guardian*, 7th March.) One thing is clear. The Labour Party had no intention at any time of stirring up any controversy whatever over the question of the H-Bomb, but, being in "opposition" they no doubt felt that some sort of censure of the Government was expected from them, and the motion finally concocted read as follows:

"That this house regrets that the statement on Defence in 1955, while recognising that thermonuclear weapons have effected a revolution in the character of warfare and that *until effective world disarmament has been achieved it is necessary as a deterrent to aggression to rely on the threat of using thermonuclear weapons*, fails to make proposals for the reorganisation of Her Majesty's Forces and Civil Defence, indicate what future defence expenditure may be called for, or to explain the grave and admitted deficiencies in the weapons with which Her Majesty's Forces are at present furnished in spite of the expenditure of some £4,000 millions for defence purposes over the past three years."

Stripped of its verbiage, this clearly means: Go ahead! We're right behind you! but we have to have something to talk about, so let's talk about how weak we are, something which we should lose no opportunity of ramming down the public throat. The only alternative presented in this motion to the H-bomb is the postponement of the issue into the indefinite future, "until effective world disarmament has been achieved", a position which exactly echoes the Government's proposition in the White Paper.³

The position taken by the Labour Party, however, deserves a little more attention. According to a report in the *Manchester Guardian* (25th March):

"[Mr. Attlee] argued that there were only two courses open to the party on defence: absolute pacifism leading to unilateral disarmament, or support for an efficient defence system. He respected the absolute pacifists, but he could not accept their view."

The question of absolute pacifism is of course neither here nor there. The

³ This was reported in the *Manchester Guardian* under the headline "DETER-RENT NOW — BUT ULTIMATE AIM IS DISARMAMENT". No doubt to the mind of an Attlee or a Churchill the suggestion that the best way to achieve disarmament would be to disarm is ludicrous, but the public can be relied upon to exercise a good deal more common sense, as the following letter to the *Manchester Guardian* would indicate (22nd February):

"Sir, — The caption 'Britain to make the H-Bomb. Deterrent now — but ultimate aim is disarmament' reminds me of the man who sprinkles petrol on a small fire in his sitting-room as the fire will die down when the house is a burn-out shell.

We are so accustomed to propaganda that we hardly notice what an insult to our intelligence this heading means. — Yours, etc.,

R. M. Koch."

position of the pacifists is at least unequivocal in its opposition to the H-Bomb. The real issue is the survival of mankind, and here again the position of the pacifists is echoed not only by statesmen, but by military "pacifists" such as Colonel Liddell Hart and General MacArthur, who have both come out with statements to the effect that war is obsolete and would mean the end of civilization, an insight so clear to even the meanest of intelligences that Mr. Attlee himself has stated publicly (*Manchester Guardian*, 21st February):

"We have had a Defence White Paper which stresses the fact that war is now completely futile, that there can be no victory for either side. This might lead to an uneasy peace but that might lead to a full peace because *once you recognise that you cannot go into a war without destroying both sides, it does seem folly to spend immense amounts of money on arms which we do not want to use.*"

Indeed! indeed! it does seem folly, yet does not Mr. Attlee stand condemned out of his own mouth when we read in the *Manchester Guardian* (25th February):

"He [Mr. Attlee] was . . . concerned to see the country's defences efficient, and he insisted that Britain must have the power to threaten the use of the H-Bomb if she were exposed to the risk of a major war. *He accepted the view that the threat of nuclear warfare might work as a deterrent.*" and again, according to the Parliamentary report in the *Manchester Guardian*:

"Mr. Attlee (Leader of the Opposition), winding up for the Opposition, said the Prime Minister had set out a pretty grim picture — no less than the danger of the destruction of civilization if war were to break out. *As there was no defence we were driven to rely on deterrents.*"

We may note in passing that the real fallacies underlying the whole theory of "deterrents" has been extensively exposed in the pages of this magazine (Jules Laurens: *Ideology and Annihilation, Contemporary Issues*, Vol. 6, No. 22), but in order to plumb the depths of political cynicism and hypocrisy we would like to quote the following (*The Listener*, 17th June, 1954):

"There are those who contend that the possession of the hydrogen bomb can be an instrument for preserving peace. It is suggested that the threat of instant retaliation by the use of this weapon can be employed to prevent a resort to armed action anywhere. *I believe this is a profound delusion* [Indeed! Indeed!] The more absolute the sanction the greater the reluctance to use it . . . (and) *the threat of its use is very dangerous because it may provoke anticipation.*"

Need we remind the Right Honourable C. R. Attlee, O.M., who wrote these words, that even if in politics we do not need the memory of elephants, that does not mean that we have the intelligence of cockroaches, and can be insulted with impunity! Will you, won't you, Mr. Attlee, will you join the dance?

Evidently Mr. Attlee will join the dance, and, having approved the manufacture of the H-Bomb, he nevertheless manifested concern for the public in this business by introducing into the debate on Four Power talks, "like an antherm into a juke box session, to give it respectability" (*Manchester Guardian*, 15th March), the question of the effects of experiments with H-Bombs on the atmosphere and on human life. He said (*Manchester Guardian*, 15th March):

"We are faced with the fact that these various scientific experiments are, apparently, making possibilities of wide change in the whole composition of the world. It is time there was a very full investigation of this. We know how

devastating the H-Bomb will be, but we do not know the long term effects due to radiation. . . Could not a halt be called to further experiments on either side of the iron curtain? People are filled with anxiety at this continued experimentation."

At least two questions would appear to be in order at this point. Was not Mr. Attlee aware that these experiments about which he appears to be concerned were going on before he approved the manufacture of the bomb in this country? And, having approved the bomb, can this concern for the future of the human race and the call to halt future experiments, like a call to lock the stable door after the horse has been *deliberately allowed* to bolt, be characterized as anything other than the purest demagogic? However, one thing is clear. The fact that "people are filled with anxiety at this continued experimentation" could not be glossed over, and something had to be done about it.

Having connived in the H-Bomb plans of the Government and having made sure that the manufacture of the bomb was approved in Parliament, the Opposition was free to approach the subject without altering anything, and thus it was that a motion was tabled for discussion on the part of the Opposition, as follows:

"That this House urges upon the Government the need to give further consideration to the long-term and remote effects of continuing nuclear explosions by the Governments of the United States, the United Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom, and expresses its fears as to the dangers facing humanity as a result of continuing radioactive contamination of the world's atmosphere, particularly to future generations; and asks that the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition be carried out and a conference of scientists from the United States, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and France be held to advise on the danger facing mankind."

If ever any principled stand was dispersed under a cloud of words, this is it. If the Opposition were really concerned about "the dangers facing humanity", the least that such a motion should have contained was a demand that all experimentation cease forthwith; for if an international conference of scientists (about which we shall have more to say later) is really required to advise on the danger facing mankind, is this not in itself sufficient justification for such a demand? The Opposition cannot have its cake and eat it. Either the dangers are known, in which case there is no need for such a conference, or they are not known, in which case it is nothing short of criminal for the Governments of these countries to continue to explode their ignorance in the face of humanity, and the least that any Oppositional motion can do is to brand the offenders as such. Not in the opinion of the Labour Party however, and if evasiveness is the chief characteristic of the speeches from the Opposition benches in the House supporting the motion,⁴ the reply of the Government in this connection was an object lesson in obfuscation.

⁴ The least one could expect was accuracy. The *Manchester Guardian* reported Dr. Edith Summerskill as stating:

"Dr. Edgar Adrian, a Nobel Prize winner, and one of Britain's finest and most famous scientists, had said that an H-Bomb war might well lead to a degree of radioactivity that none could tolerate or escape."

Whereas a report in *Peace News* (25th February) states:

"Dr. E. D. Adrian in his presidential address to the annual meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science had warned his hearers on September the 1st, 1954 that *repeated atomic explosions* might lead to a degree of general radioactivity that none could tolerate or escape."

Mr. Mcleod, the Minister of Health, after presenting various figures, the trustworthiness of which, as we shall see, is, to say the least, doubtful, stated (*Manchester Guardian*, 23rd March):

"At the present levels of irradiation it seems [!] improbable [!] that we have anything more here than an interesting [this on a matter of life and death! — P.H.] basic scientific problem, and a situation which has to be watched very carefully [no doubt the most effective method of 'watching' the situation is to manufacture even more H-Bombs — P.H.]"

Later in the same speech he stated:

"These are the conclusions I would like to put to the house:

1. *Radiation produces genetic effects and the radioactivity of the planet has been slightly increased as a result of nuclear bomb explosions.*

2. *I am told that our present knowledge is insufficient to fix at all precisely the level of radioactivity above which genetic changes would significantly affect the well-being of populations.*

3. *Research in genetic changes is inevitably slow.*

4. *Most important of all, it is unlikely [!] that the increased incidence of radioactivity which has occurred up to the present will have any appreciable genetic effect."*

Is it possible to imagine more pitiful assurances, "assurances" involving admissions "that our present knowledge is insufficient", that "research is slow", and the bland statement that it is "unlikely" that any damage has been done? How Mr. Mcleod can possibly arrive at his fourth conclusion in the light of his two preceding ones, no doubt only a cabinet minister can understand, but if our "knowledge is insufficient" and "research is slow" this is not surprising for whereas the estimates for defence expenditure (direct and indirect armaments) add up to the staggering sum of £1,537,200,000 (CMD. 9391), Mr. Mcleod revealed in his speech that:

"The council's [The Council of Medical Research] expenditure for separate work in their own establishments into all aspects of the effects of radiation was, in the provisional estimates for 1955-6, £208,000."

The *British Medical Journal* (2nd April) asks the pertinent question as to how much, or how little of this already minute sum is devoted to direct research into the genetic effects of low level radiation on mammals.

Thus, while money for the madness of destruction is virtually unlimited, money for those attempting to establish standards for the future well-being of mankind is pitifully inadequate. According to a report in the *Observer* (13th March):

"Dr. J. Loutit of the Medical Research Council, Radiobiological Research Unit, at Harwell, said in an interview last week that while safety standards for work with radioactive substances may be perfectly adequate as far as direct damage to sensitive tissues like bone marrow or the skin is concerned, over a long period they could still be inadequate for preventing genetical effects. Little is known about these effects, or about human genetics in general, and a great deal of research will be necessary before the facts can be established . . . so far there is only one research project of any size on this subject in this country — at present there are no funds for any more."

In view of this, are we not at least entitled to ask Mr. Mcleod for definitive scientific authority to back his contention that it is "unlikely that the increased incidence of radioactivity which has occurred up to the present will have any appreciable genetic effects", and for more reliable scientific data as regards his figures supporting this assertion, figures which he himself characterized as guesses? What Mr. Mcleod seems to forget is the time honoured principle that *the onus is on him and his collaborators to prove the absence of public danger before exposing us to its possibility*, for

which purpose "hazarding a guess" is certainly not satisfactory.

Mr. Mcleod's little scientific excursion needs a little closer examination. During the course of his speech he stated (*Manchester Guardian*, 23rd March):

"Our calculations . . . show that here the figure [the quantitative index of the radiation to which we have been exposed — P.H.] would be about one third of the American figure [one tenth of one R.U. — roentgen unit, a measure of radiation — P.H.] and this includes all the future radiation results of all the explosions that have taken place so far. But even this figure of 0.03 of an R.U. is artificially high. . . ."

The American figure quoted is derived from the American Atomic Energy Commission's Report on the effects of Hydrogen Bomb explosions (*Manchester Guardian*, 1st March), and whatever one's opinion may be of the reliability of the information disseminated by this august institution,⁶ the purposes to which this figure was put, the attempt to lull public anxieties on the matter, was exposed by the special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* (16th March):

" . . . several experiments have shown that the number of mutations produced by X-rays or radioactivity is proportional to the amount of artificial radiation. . . . Therefore damage done to a population as a whole is the same as if a 100 people are given a dose of 10 r., as if 10,000 are given a dose of 0.1 r., or if a 1,000,000 receive a dose of 0.001 r. It is clear that in such terms the smallest amounts of radioactivity endow the population as a whole with a proportional amount of malignancy."

And Mr. Mcleod has recognized this fact when he states:

"It seemed probable that mutations were produced with a frequency proportional to the dose of radiation . . . and most mutations were harmful." Thus, in the light of his own admissions we are justified in saying that the quotation of any figures whatsoever in connection with genetic effects must be a deception, since any increase, and Mr. Mcleod has himself admitted that an increase has taken place, is harmful. This however does not stop him from carrying the deception a stage further. He goes on:

"The real question is, of course, what level is permissible? Is there a threshold of radioactivity . . . beyond which man's genetic constitution might stand at risk? The dose of radiation which has been agreed by an international com-

⁶ The untrustworthiness of the American Atomic Energy Commission is by now a household word, and so patent that the *Manchester Guardian* was forced to take them seriously to task in a leading article:

"Mr. Strauss, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has made a statement intended to quieten public fears about the dangers of test explosions of nuclear bombs. . . . He said that the amount of radiation experienced by the American people is no more than the radiation they receive every few days. But he chose to ignore that, according to his own commission, the amount of radiation they have received from Hydrogen bomb tests in the Pacific and elsewhere is as much as they receive from natural sources in a whole year. And he went on to confuse the issue with a new idea; he talked about 'showers of cosmic rays' and said that during these the level of natural radiation is unusually high. But Mr. Strauss must know that these showers are occurring all the time and that they are not forgotten when estimates are made of the normal level of radiation. . . . No doubt it would be convenient to Mr. Strauss [and others — P.H.] if discussion of this unresolved question could be stilled. But he will only create an impression of sinister intent by statements like this. WE DESERVE THE TREATMENT DUE TO ADULTS."

For further material to this effect see *Experiment in Annihilation* by Jules Laurens, *Contemporary Issues*, Vol. 5, No. 20.

mission is 0.3 r. a week or, taking working hours and holidays into effect, perhaps 15 r. a year.

"That is enormously greater than any of the figures we have been discussing . . ."

With this the deception, as yet implicit, becomes explicit in the most cynical fashion, for we must assume that Mr. Mcleod, who, on his own admission, consorts with "professors of international standing in this field", is at least as well informed as the careful layman, and should therefore know that "in setting up the maximum permissible doses for those occupationally exposed to radiations, account was taken of the fact that only a small fraction of the population, less than 1 per cent, is habitually exposed to radiation". (*British Medical Journal*, 26th March.) When the total population is exposed, a very different story must be told, as the following letter to the *Manchester Guardian* (29th March) would indicate:

"Sir — You quote Mr. Mcleod, the Minister of Health [1] as having said that 'the main worry is the threshold beyond which man's genetic constitution might stand at risk'. I submit that this is a dangerous and misleading statement. In a publication of 'Radiation Effects', sponsored by the National Research Council of the United States, Professor H. J. Muller maintains that any harmful mutation results in a disadvantageous general effect. *The effect is spread over the population as a whole, and consequently is not noticeable. Nevertheless it has been calculated that there will be as many genetic deaths in a population as mutants arising in it. The result of increased mutations will be a generalised inadequacy among the population. Thus any increase in the mutation rate must be regarded as deleterious, and the only threshold is that which if exceeded will result in man's extinction.* . . . Yours, etc., Erasmus Harland."

In any case, does Mr. Mcleod, operating with such cairion concepts as the "harmless dose", take us all for idiots when any one can read in the daily press statements by eminent scientists such as the following?

By Professor J. Rotblatt, Professor of Physics, St. Bartholomew's Hospital, London.

"In the case of hydrogen bombs, the genetic hazard arises from the radioactivity which has been carried into the upper atmosphere and then distributed all over the globe, raising the level of radiation everywhere in the world. *From the genetic point of view any increase in radiation is harmful, and the release of huge quantities of radioactivity in an atomic war, or even in repeated tests, is bound to lead to a gradual deterioration in the human species.*" (*Daily Telegraph*, 10th March.)

By Professor Frederick Soddy, Nobel Prizewinner (described as "the man who made the discovery which started it all") (*Sunday Chronicle*, 29th March):

"The explosions', he declared, 'are fouling the air with radioactivity. *IT IS NONSENSE TO SAY IT IS HARMLESS*' [original emphasis].

"The 77-year-old professor gave these two grave forecasts on the increasing fall-out from atomic piles and explosions:

1. Radioactive gases can, and may, devastate the natural resources of the countryside and bring economic chaos and ruin.
2. *The mutation of genes in living people may be affected to the extent of jeopardising the future fertility of the human race.*"

While a report in the *Manchester Guardian* (14th April) states:

"The magazine 'Canadian Chemical Processing' stated today that it had received a cable from Professor Frederick Soddy, the Nobel prize-man in chemistry, proposing a halt in atomic explosions. The magazine said the cable stated:

"I beg Canadian scientists to demand a moratorium forbidding (the) further mass liberation (of atomic energy). Even so-called peaceful applications pollute the atmosphere and may change climates, endangering the economy of neighbouring nations."

"An article appearing in the next issue of the magazine by Dr. James Foulkes of the University of British Columbia, refers to reports 'that the thyroiodiodine content of cattle all over the world appears to have been significantly increased by the contaminations to date'.⁷ Dr. Foulkes says radiation limits could be set on an immediate basis, but that *even slight fall-out from nuclear explosions could have a long-range 'buildup effect'. There is no safe level of radiation which is devoid of possible harmful effects.'*"

These are but a few examples which could be increased many times, but it is clear that if "there is no safe level of radiation which is devoid of possible harmful effects", Mr. Mcleod's, or any other figures in this regard cannot be regarded as valid indices, and sufficient has been said to justify Miss E. Burton when she stated in the House of Commons (*Manchester Guardian*, 23rd March):

"If we have to choose between Ministers or the Scientists responsible for the articles appearing in the press, members opposite will not be surprised if we choose the scientists."

If Mr. Mcleod had the temerity to gloss over his "dangerous and misleading statements" with a "scientific" varnish, other Government representatives have no compunction whatever about the insults they hurl at the public intention. Thus Mr. H. A. Nutting, Minister of State (*Manchester Guardian*, 22nd March):

"... my scientific advice at the moment is that there is no danger to human life or the reproduction of the human animal from any explosions which have taken place so far."

In the face of this enormity, even the respectable *Manchester Guardian*, which could find it in its heart to welcome the statement by Mr. Mcleod, was appalled, and its leading article of the 24th March adopted a polemical tone unusual in present-day British journalism. It is worth quoting almost in full:

"The Government cannot get away with brushing under the carpet all questions about the genetic effect of testing hydrogen bombs and other nuclear weapons. It does itself no service. *The matter is serious and is the cause of much anxiety which will not be allayed by bald Ministerial answers in the House of Commons.* The Government ought to be far more open in today's debate than it has been hitherto. *Will it name the scientific authorities on whose advice, Mr. Nutting said yesterday that there was 'no danger' to the reproduction of human beings from the tests which have taken place?* Is it simply accepting the conclusions of the report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, although the report said that there was a wide range of admissible opinion, or has it taken other advice? *Will it publish the views of geneticists at Harwell and other centres of British research. . . Do the British authorities discount the risk that the harmful effect of radiation will not become evident until too late — until, in fact, future generations produce handicapped children?* (Malignant genes resulting from radiation will not show their evil effect until paired in a male and female who carry the same mutated gene.) *Is the Government certain that future weapons tests will not add to the accumulated radiation in the atmosphere? Can it quote any scientific authority in support of such a view and publish the evidence?* If it brushes them aside, as it has done so far, it will only aggravate public anxiety. It seems dangerously complacent. Can it justify the suggestion, made by Mr. Nutting yesterday and contained in today's Government amendment, that a limitation of tests must await 'comprehensive disarmament'? *Disarmament, as it well knows, is exceedingly unlikely.*

⁷ This is an index of depression of the secretory activities of the thyroid gland. Marked depression of this gland results in *Myxoedema*, a disease characterized by lethargy, obesity, menstruation disorders, and many other symptoms, in fact, the depression of *all* vital processes. It responds to treatment, but the symptoms reappear if the treatment is stopped.

Are the tests to continue regardless of the injury they may cause to our grandchildren?"

One thing emerges from all that has been said, and that is the imperative obligation of the Government to supply the public with all the information that it has at its disposal on this and all other related subjects so that the real nature of the situation can be assessed. That the Government has at its disposal far more information than it has as yet seen fit to divulge is evident from the following report in the *Evening News* (18th March):

"Picked R.A.F. bomber crews are carrying out high level patrols over Britain in search of radioactivity. . . .

"The job is to bring back particles of dust to enable atomic scientists to probe the level of radiation. . . .

"The latest probe into the atmosphere up to 12 miles above Britain has been concerned with clouds of particles originating from the biggest atomic explosion of the present American series. . . .

"The R.A.F.'s medical experts are studying this matter closely. One paper submitted on the subject says it would be possible for an aircraft flying on a standard course for several hours to push into its pressurised cabin, and into the people aboard, 'measurable amounts of fission products'."

And in the report it is stated that "*the operations are being conducted under the greatest secrecy*". Might we be permitted to ask why, if Mr. Nutting's scientific advice is so reliable? Or must we simply be "reassured"?

In this connection it is clear that no international conference of scientists is needed for the enlightenment of the public to a far greater degree than is at present being done; and the demand of the Opposition in this respect can thus be clearly exposed as a red herring, the only function of which could be their connivance with the Government in keeping the public in ignorance, the more especially so in view of the fact that the powers who it was proposed were to send scientists to this conference would have represented those very Governments who have a vested interest in the making of bombs. It is significant that only those four are mentioned in the Opposition motion quoted earlier, namely, the U.K., the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., and France, who, at that time, had not yet rescinded her decision to manufacture the hydrogen bomb. Under these circumstances is there any guarantee whatsoever that the objectivity and impartiality which would be the precondition for reliable scientific enquiry could be said to exist? The question answers itself when one compares the following two statements:

"Sir John Cockcroft told a private meeting last night that the level of radioactive contamination in the world produced by all the atomic bomb explosions and peaceful atomic energy activities 'is at present so low that it should not cause any anxiety' [?]. The radiation level that would give rise to serious harmful effects was probably a thousand times the present level of contamination [?!], but we did not at present know this figure with any accuracy, and long term genetic studies were required to determine this."

"Sir John . . . said he would try to dispose of another 'popular horror' of the so-called Cobalt Bomb.

"There seems,' he went on, 'to be a general belief that still more lethal types of bomb could be produced by incorporating cobalt into a hydrogen bomb and that such bombs might poison the whole earth. Our studies lead us to the conclusion that there is nothing in this idea — the cobalt bomb would offer no advantages to a lunatic designer.'

A statement by Professor Otto Hahn, President of the Max Planck Society, and winner of the Nobel Prize in 1945 for his work on nuclear physics, is however reported as follows (*Manchester Guardian*, 18th February):

"In his talk — entitled 'Cobalt 60: A danger or a blessing for the human race?' — Professor Hahn said mankind was for the first time in a position to destroy itself. *He believed that the explosion anywhere, of 10 hydrogen bombs coated with cobalt would make the survival of the human race highly improbable.* [Nothing in this ideal! . . .]

"Professor Hahn pointed out that hydrogen bombs were immensely more dangerous than their predecessors because they could be made to any size. *Their coating of radioactive cobalt cost one ten-thousandth part of the amount of radium when would be equally effective.* [No advantages to lunatic designers — Sir John? — your studies must be most comprehensive! — P.H.] If coated with cobalt, the hydrogen bomb's radioactive dust would continue to cause death for many years after the explosion."

It is thus clear that in view of the shroud of secrecy in which the Government is wrapping information vital to our survival, conferences of such "scientists" in order to decide what not to tell the public are not good enough. As the *Manchester Guardian* stated in its leader (23rd March):

"But . . . an international conference is not necessary. There are accepted means of communicating scientific information through the recognised scientific journals. *It would be sufficient if the Government were to encourage its scientists to publish the results of their experiments as quickly as possible; to take steps to inform the public of the design and progress of these experiments; and to stimulate discussion among the scientific public.* [It is a pity that, instead, the Medical Research Council unit has gone behind the fence at Harwell — it does not occur to the *Manchester Guardian* to ask the question why — P.H.] All these things could be done. The Government should decide to do them now."

That the intentions of the Government, however, lie in quite another direction, is clear from the following news item, reported in the *Daily Sketch* (21st March):

"Any 'traitor gap' in Britain's safety net is to be closed. Many of the 7,000 men and women in eight atomic plants who have access to secret documents or processes have never been screened.

"Within two months U.S. Government agents are to vet Britain's security system to pave the way for an exchange of nuclear information.

"But first a law must be passed by the U.S. Congress before secrets can be shared.

"*Hopes of changing the U.S. Law are slim unless Britain can show she is proof against further betrayals.*"

And in order that no doubt whatsoever shall exist as to the intent of this little bit of international co-operation and the exact interpretation to be placed upon the word "betrayal", the *Manchester Guardian* (14th March) informs us:

"Dr. Ray Lanier and Dr. Theodore Puck, of the University of Colorado Medical Centre, said yesterday that the fall-out had reached a stage where it could no longer be ignored by those concerned with public health and safety. Dr. Lanier, Head of the Radiology Department, said that 'for the first time in the history of the Nevada tests, the upsurge in radioactive measured here within a matter of hours after the tests has become appreciable'. Dr. Puck, Head of the Biophysics Department, said radioactive dust was breathed into the lungs where it might come in contact with living tissue.

" . . . The Governor of Colorado, Mr. Edwin Johnson, called the scientists' remarks 'phoney' and said they should be arrested. [1] 'It will only alarm people,' the Governor said. 'Someone has a screw loose some place and I intend to find out about it.'

The implications are unmistakable. The manufacture of the H-Bomb and A-Bomb, the withholding of vital information, and the deliberate deception of the people within the framework of security regulations backed by the threat of arrest against those who dare open their mouths, in a

word, totalitarianism, go hand-in-hand. From the Government point of view, even the views of their own tame scientists in this connection cannot be considered "trustworthy" and Mr. Nutting, whom we have already met, and who is described in official circles as a particular protégé of Sir Anthony Eden's, and a rising star in the Tory party, in reply to a question on the meeting of international scientists, to which we have already referred, stated (*Manchester Guardian*, 22nd March):

"I think this must be dealt with through Governments [!] and not left [!] to international scientists [!]."

What are we to understand by this? That the Government will go its own sweet way independently of the views of scientists and, it necessarily follows, of public opinion which might be influenced by these views! Could cynical disregard for the welfare of humanity and commitment to irresponsibility be more clearly stated! And yet Sir Winston Churchill, in his statement on his decision to manufacture the bomb, did not scruple to place this charge at the door of — the public! He stated (*Hansard*, 1st March):

".... A vast quantity of information — some true, some exaggerated, much out of proportion — has been published about the hydrogen bomb. [No thanks to you and your precious Government — P.H.] The truth has inevitably been mingled with fiction, but I am glad to say that panic has not accrued. Panic would not necessarily make for peace. That is one reason why I have been most anxious that *irresponsible discussions* on this matter should not take place on the B.B.C. or television programmes."

Thus, when our democratic Government makes what Sir Winston Churchill himself characterizes as "a grave decision", and we the public, on whose behalf the Government dares to make this decision, and whose money will be spent in implementing it, wish to discuss the matter (and it makes no difference whether such discussion takes place on the B.B.C. or anywhere else) we are to be labelled irresponsible. Must we remind this "great" orator, who commands so many fine phrases about freedom and the free world, that public discussion is the essence of democracy and freedom? Discussion may be misinformed, in which case the answer is to supply information, for the lack of which the Government and they alone are "responsible", but it can never be irresponsible, as, for instance, can the decision to disregard the statements of responsible scientists. But in order to understand this monstrous charge and the implied threat behind it, it is necessary to examine a bit more closely the behaviour of the Rt. Hon. Sir Winston Churchill and his democratic Government with regard to this business, after which, perhaps, our notions about "responsibility" will become a little clearer.

The first intimation that the general public had of the Government's decision was the bald statement in the White Paper on Defence (CMD. 9391, HMSO, 17th February) to the effect that:

"After fully considering all the implications of this step [except, of course, the opinion of the British people — P.H.] the Government have thought it their duty to proceed with [the] . . . development and production [of Hydrogen Bombs]."

And in his speech in the House of Commons, Sir Winston Churchill stated:

"Only three countries possess in varying degrees the knowledge and the power to make nuclear weapons. Of these America is overwhelmingly the chief. Owing to the breakdown in the exchange of information between us and the United States, since 1946, we have had to start again independently on our own.

Fortunately, action was taken promptly by Mr. Attlee to reduce as far as possible the delay in our nuclear development and production. By his initiative we have made our own atomic bombs. Confronted with the Hydrogen Bomb, I have tried to live up to his standard. *We have started making that one too.*⁷

It is of course the cunning of the old fox which makes Churchill right from the start take the wind out of the sails of the "Opposition" in the Parliamentary dog fight by showing that the decision is but the extension of the policy undertaken by this very same Opposition when it was in power, though undoubtedly the operative phrase here is the admission of arbitrary action: "We have started making that one too!"

To have started already implies much preparation and planning, building of equipment, research, etc., and a hint of this may be gleaned from the fact that the weapons establishment at Aldermaston has for some time (at least as far back as November, 1954, in the *Atomic Scientists Journal*) been advertising for astro-physical engineers.⁸ In any case, we are certainly safe in assuming that the *decision*, quite apart from any subsequent action on it, was at least six months old at the time of its announcement. Might we then be permitted to ask why this "grave" decision was not communicated to the British people until now? Was it perhaps because our democratic Government feared the reaction of the British people after having had an object lesson in the form both of the reaction in America following President Truman's initial announcement, and the veritable worldwide storm of protest which followed the tests in the Marshall Islands last March?⁹ Being realists, they no doubt felt that the moment was not "opportune" until the project amounted to a *fait accompli*. Sir Winston Churchill, in another part of his speech was careful to differentiate between the Russian people and the Russian Government. He stated:

"The House will, perhaps, note that I avoid using the word 'Russia' as much as possible in this discussion. I have a strong admiration for the Russian people — their bravery, their many gifts, and their kindly nature. It is the Communist dictatorship and the declared ambition of the Communists¹⁰ . . . that is what we are bound to resist. . . ."

⁸ Astro-physics deals with the interiors of stars — usually *very* hot; and engineering refers to the *practical application on earth* of the science. There is only one such application.

⁹ For a detailed analysis of these reactions see *Contemporary Issues*, Vol. 5, No. 20, and Vol. 6, No. 22.

¹⁰ The Communist Party has been curiously reticent about this whole business, although this is hardly surprising in view of the fact that any movement which condemns the H-Bomb and brands its manufacturers and exploders as criminal equally condemns the Russian Government, and the Government, insofar as it has acknowledged this opposition at all, cannot denounce as Communist an opposition of which by no means the least vocal section consists of religious organizations and individuals. The Stalinists, however, seem at present to be busily propagating two diametrically opposite lines in this connection. Attention is drawn to this in a leading article in the *Manchester Guardian* (17th March):

"*Pravda's* commentary on atomic affairs is worth following . . . it shows the difference between what the Russian Government is saying to its people at home and what it says to foreign audiences. The public in Russia is being told that their future is secure; listeners abroad are being told that atomic warfare will destroy the world. Thus *Pravda* last week wrote:

"The imperialists may attempt to blackmail the peace-loving peoples with atomic bombs, but they cannot alter the course of history. The peoples have been and are the main force of history. It is they who have decided in the past and will decide in the future the fate of progress, the fate of civilisation."

Well said Sir Winston, but what is one to say of the behaviour of a Government which, in the face of an unequivocal world protest at this very same madness on the part of the American Government, nevertheless embarks upon the project and only afterwards seeks ratification from the elected legislature? When rule by Order-in-Council replaces democratic procedure does this not differentiate the British Government from the British people, and is not such a Government on the right path to emulating the behaviour of the very same Communist dictatorship which Sir Winston pretends to abhor? Nothing daunted however, Sir Winston continues:

"That is the policy we have decided to pursue. That is what we are now doing and I am thankful it is endorsed by a mass of responsible opinion on both sides of the House and, I believe, by a great majority of the nation."

What evidence he has to support this belief only he knows, but the indignation with which his statement was received may be gauged from the following letter (one of many in the national press to the same effect) to the *Manchester Guardian* (14th March):

"Sir, — In your issue of March 7th, Lord Hinchinbroke took up an argument about the reason 'why the people of this country have accepted the manufacture of the Hydrogen Bomb'. He doubts profoundly whether more than a few of us sincerely believe the alternative is to be communised, and with this I wholeheartedly agree. *It is the basic assumption that the people of England have 'accepted' this course which takes my breath away. I have not accepted it, nor has my wife, or my friends, and numbers of people have voiced their non-acceptance in the national press. The fact is, the people of this country have not been consulted about it, though the choice is admitted to be the gravest ever faced by man. Surely this is a monstrous and indefensible omission*

"Assertions about the possibility of the destruction of world civilisation if the imperialists unleash a third world war are theoretically erroneous and politically harmful [thanks for telling us! — P.H.]. Such assertions are convenient only to the imperialist warmongers, who hope to intimidate the peoples by atomic blackmail. . . .

"The camp of democracy and socialism, supported by all peace-loving peoples is a formidable and indestructible force. If the imperialists succeed in unleashing a third world war, then the result will be the destruction, not of world civilisation, but of the capitalist system, rotten to its roots.' [Whewl]

"This stands in contrast with a broadcast from Russia in the foreign language services last week by Tatiana Zuyeva, a Minister of Culture [!] who addressed herself to 'Mothers and Grandmothers' everywhere. No-one anywhere, she said, could be sure of the safety in another war of their sons, husbands, and homes.

"Not a single country, not a single town, not a single island can be called safe in a future war. If war starts, every part of the world will be vulnerable, every life in danger. Those who want to let war loose are those who want to atom bomb Moscow, but even if the first bomb does fall on the capital of our country, who can say where the second bomb will fall, and the third, and the fifth?"

"Reassurance for Russians, blood-curdling for foreigners: such is the pattern."

At least one prominent Stalinist, furthermore, Professor Joliot-Curie, has been severely rapped over the knuckles for following the internal line externally and saying the wrong thing to the wrong people at the wrong time in the wrong country. One thing, however, is absolutely certain: as the movement against the H-Bomb develops, the Stalinists will stick their noses in in order to confuse it, befoul it, and betray it, although what particularly dirty tactics they will use remains to be seen.

and a referendum or plebiscite on the question should be made immediately.
— Yours, etc., Richard Armstrong."

A monstrous and indefensible omission indeed, and if referenda, plebiscites, "testing the feelings of the electors", public discussion, etc., characterize democratic behaviour, arbitrariness and irresponsibility equally characterize state institutions and their organs of propaganda and misinformation, and the bureaucratic set-up may be relied upon to back the Government almost without their having to raise a finger. Thus, within days, rules and regulations regarding public debate started making themselves felt, and a ban on a discussion on the matter was enforced by the B.B.C. According to a report in the *Manchester Guardian* (21st February):

"Mr. E. Shinwell, M.P., a former Minister of Defence, referred to 'some confounded rule' which has resulted in the postponement of a broadcast discussion of the Defence White Paper in which he was to have taken part this week. The broadcast was postponed under the rule which precludes discussion on the radio or television of any subject due for debate in Parliament within fourteen days. . . .

"It is all governed by some confounded rule I heard of only a short time ago [?]. I have no recollection of how it was made. I think it is a lot of nonsense."

A most convenient loss of memory for a prominent member of the Labour party and a former Minister of Defence, but Mr. Shinwell's memory is somewhat better than he would have us believe, for he states (*Manchester Guardian*, 21st February):

"It is for the B.B.C. to decide. [?] It is an independent body, *except when the Government and Opposition step in and prevent it from being independent.*"

And to refresh Mr. Shinwell's memory let us inform him in the words of the *Daily Mirror* (19th February):

"It [the ban] was opposed in February, 1947, by the B.B.C. *after discussions with the Labour Government of that time, and the Tory Opposition.*"

Once again the essential identity of both Government and Opposition is exposed, and however harmless the loss of half an hour's chatting on the B.B.C. by carefully "guided" M.P.s at the behest of the two major political parties may be, the wider implications are certainly not lost on the general public. A letter to the *Manchester Guardian* (5th March) states:

"Sir — It appears to me that this attempt of the party leaders to prevent radio discussion is the most insolent act of which politicians have been guilty since the eighteenth century . . . so far as I can remember, nothing of the sort has been tried during the last 120 years, until now we find that not the House of Commons but merely the two party organisations have concurred in forcing a timorous B.B.C. to suppress discussion of matters of urgent public importance.

"Many of us have for a long time suspected the party organisations of caring more for power than for principle. But this is the first time that they have co-operated, not in disciplining the House of Commons but in disciplining the ordinary citizen. They have no legal authority to do this; and, if the B.B.C. had as much courage as the ordinary newspaper editor, it would refuse to submit to this arbitrary and irresponsible control. . . .

Yours, etc., W. Lyon Blease."

The ramifications are even wider than this, however, and the following letter to the *Manchester Guardian* is self-explanatory:

"Sir — Your correspondent Mr. Edwards asks if the B.B.C. cannot waive its rule against allowing minority parties to broadcast so that Sir Richard Acland can speak on the air.

"Surely it is fantastic that there should be such a rule to be waived. In point of fact it is not imposed by the B.B.C., but is a closed shop operated by the big parties.

"I do not believe that political parties do Parliament or free speech any service in this country by themselves assuming the power by this rule and the 'fourteen day rule' to decide what political views the public shall hear and when. . . .

Yours, etc., J. Grimond."

We may be sure that the party organizations knew just what they were doing and whom they were serving, however, when they imposed this rule. According to a report in the *Times* (18th May), in connection with the present election:

" . . . all the political parties are concentrating a great part of their effort on the election broadcasts. After much hesitation at first about using the new medium the party organisers have all now seized upon the importance of the B.B.C. estimate that the television public has grown to 12 million — which is an addition to the 24 million adults [almost the whole electorate — P.H.] accessible through sound broadcasting.

"The technique of approaching the electors by these means of mass appeal, undreamt of in the past, is being exploited to the full to produce the maximum impact before the election broadcasting ends on Saturday."

This monopoly of the means of propaganda also bears hard on the Liberal Party, struggling to regain some semblance of former glory,¹¹ and in response to certain comments (in a different connection) regarding the Liberal Party, the leader, Mr. Clement Davies, expressed himself in no uncertain terms in his election message to Mr. John Bannerman (14th December, 1954):

"Quite obviously, he (Sir Winston Churchill) has decided that the people of Scotland, and indeed, anywhere else, shall have, at the most, the choice of voting only for either a Socialist candidate, or a Tory candidate. There shall be no other choice put before the people, by order of Sir Winston Churchill! The road of freedom is barred, by order of Sir Winston Churchill! No one shall stand as a Liberal for Parliament, by order of Sir Winston Churchill! No one shall vote for a Liberal and if he does he shall be branded as a shirker, by order of Sir Winston Churchill! Is this the new Tory democracy of 'progressive' Tories? *It looks to me as if the doctrine of Fascism had entered the doors of No. 10 Downing Street.*"

This stranglehold of the two major parties, in reality one, is a matter very much in the forefront of the public mind, especially in view of the impending election, as the following letter to the *Times* (27th April) will testify:

"Sir — . . . The (forthcoming) election will, of course, be fought on purely party lines. . . . The individual candidate counts for practically nothing and is only a nominal figure-head.

"It is now virtually impossible to be elected to the House of Commons without the support of one or other party machine. . . . Thus the new House of Commons will consist of party men pledged to a party programme.

"If a member be sufficiently bold to vote against his party, he will be in grave danger of not being supported by the party at the following election and so his political career will come to a tragic end . . . (and) when party loyalty, the price of political survival, is able to stop a member speaking and voting as his own intelligence and conscience guides him, democracy is in danger.

"It was Edmund Burke who said: 'I believe that the darkest menace to our freedom would come in that moment when it was definitely pronounced that a

¹¹ Nevertheless, if the Liberal Party wishes to attain a position as a real alternative to the two giant parties, something more is required than pretensions to democratic virtue, and in its refusal to take a stand on the matter of the H-Bomb, in spite of strong pressures from the membership, as reports of the Liberal Assembly at Llandudno this year as well as letters to the press from Liberals would indicate, it has shown that it has no positive alternative to offer the public.

man was compelled in the House of Commons to give a vote irrespective of the debate upon which that vote was given, because he had received orders which, as a condition of his livelihood, he was compelled to obey.' Is not such a state of affairs now a reality?"

This is further attested by Sir Richard Acland, for, according to a report in the *Manchester Guardian* (19th March):

"Discussing his own resignation, Sir Richard recalls the advice to the holders of minority opinions within major organisations: 'Stay inside and argue your case from within.' He notes that those who give this advice 'do not notice that argument from within is often tolerated by the controllers of the organisation just so long as it will clearly fall short of being effective'."

Just how farcical the whole business of "party loyalty" can become, we have already seen with regard to the Bevan-Attlee "quarrel". And we have also seen the way in which it may be used as a smokescreen to cover far more questionable practices. Its relevance to the matter in hand was shown by Sidney Silverman, M.P., who stated at the time (*Manchester Guardian*, 7th March):

"It is not a question of Attlee or Bevan. What is involved is Parliament itself.

"This is no personal quarrel. It is not a struggle for leadership. *It is a crisis of Democracy*. . . . Should this country make Hydrogen bombs? . . . Millions of Labour voters, as well as millions of others say 'No' to . . . (this question). Others, no doubt, say 'Yes'.

"With those who say that the Majority must prevail I have no argument, but a majority of whom? Not, surely, a majority of the Parliamentary party reached at a secret meeting, no-one knowing who attended, what they said, or how they voted. Such a decision carries neither conviction nor authority. . . ."

There can be no doubt that Mr. Silverman is correct: The question of the Hydrogen Bomb has indeed precipitated a "crisis of Democracy". Nor, as we have shown, is Mr. Silverman alone in thinking so. A letter in the *Times* (19th March) puts the matter in a nutshell:

"Sir, — Several recent letters in your columns inspire the hope that there exists in this country a public opinion with a passionate disbelief in the present arms race. This opinion cuts across creeds and political alignments and I think is prompted by conscience [heavily supported by the utmost rationality — P.H.] the knowledge that our present national course is wrong, and that from wrong things, right things cannot come. If we got together, we should be strong enough to compel a change of policy. Is this Sir Richard Acland's opportunity; or who shall be our leader? Yours, etc., Raymond Broad."

Time alone will show how well founded Mr. Broad's hopes are, and give the answer to his question. One thing, however, is sure: The Government, whichever party happens to be in power, will not make good their "monstrous and indefensible omission" to consult the British people on the question of the Hydrogen Bomb without being subjected to the utmost pressure, not necessarily at election time.

May, 1955.

Erik Erikson

CRITICAL REVUE ON DOCTOR FAUSTUS

Prologue in the Heaven of Art*

DRAMATIS PERSONAE

Apollo Musagetes, chief of the Muses

Clio

Melpomene } Muses

Thalia

Mephistopheles, a powerful and agitating person

Scene

The institute for modern art and literature in the heaven of art. A large lustre hangs crookedly from the ceiling and symbolizes the psychological mode of consideration. Sofas, tables, chairs and shelves are in filthy condition and partly broken. Everywhere are hanging modern paintings, manifestos of different art schools and reviews of contemporary books, among them reviews by Thomas Mann praising his own works. Modern sculptures are standing around; at the left in the foreground a self-representation of Picasso in the form of a completely intertwined bicycle, overpainted with crying colors. Apollo as an old man with long hair and beard lies sleeping in an armchair, clothed in a filthy and torn morning-gown. The Muses, with shaggy hair, also in threadbare robes and not less filthy and old than Apollo, are standing beneath the lustre and look desperately at Thomas Mann's works which are hanging from the lustre on a thick rope.

Clio

Woe! Thomas writes in his old manner,
produces books, puts up his show,
has waved his wellknown wretched banner
for nearly sixty years by now.
His writings make us sick and weary;
we are in fact in full decay!
His works remain as dry and dreary
as ever since their primal day.

* This *Prologue* is part of a Faust-comedy which corresponds in its outward structure to Goethe's *Faust*, i.e. the play or the "Dramatic Poem" itself is preceded by a *Dedication*, a *Prelude in the Theatre* and (the present) *Prologue in Heaven* (of art). Though the main subject of attack is not Goethe's, but Thomas Mann's *Faustus*, the *Prologue* contains many allusions to verses by Goethe (especially some which have become in Germany winged words) and parodies here and there Goethe's manner of rhyming — trying, however, to make sense with such rhyming where it has in Goethe often enough no sense at all. The translation of this *Prologue* from the German original is the author's own — the explanatory notes have been added by him for the orientation of the English reader.

Melpomene

He lauds whatever he created.
 His works and praises are at odds:
 He has in both well compensated
 the weak points by still weaker spots.
 In fateful dull elaboration
 his writings turn from bad to worse,
 and our mouths in desperation
 are bound to yawn with all their force.

Thalia

He sticks to us with endless clatter
 and pains us with his horrid dram:
 That dreadful stuff, that musty matter
 in form of literary sham.
 Whatever subject he may use,
 he gives the same insipid pap;
 whatever standpoint he may choose,
 he leads into a tricky trap.

All three

Woe! Thomas makes us sick and weary;
 we are in fact in full decay!
 His works remain as dry and dreary
 as ever since their primal day.¹

(they run to Apollo and try to shake him awake with all their force, using also slaps and blows)

Wake up, Apollo! too great is our plight!
 We cry for vengeance as our rightful right!

Apollo (still dizzy with sleep)

What's going on? Who dares to break my rest?

The Muses

We are near death, tremendously oppressed
 by modern art and its deficiency!

Apollo (as before)

Mephisto, out! ne'er shalt thou question me!

The Muses (shaking him again)

Mephisto is not here! the Muses moan and yell:
 We live through modern art in deepest hell!

Apollo

(slowly coming to his senses and looking around in amazement)

What did I hear of modern art and hell? (irate)
 The deuce! would you be so kind to tell

¹ These stanzas are a parody of those spoken by the three Archangels at the opening of Goethe's *Prologue in Heaven*.

me where I am, and whence you came?
 I surely am not in my usual frame!
 My senses tell me it's somebody's scheme:
 I am bewitched! it is an ugly dream!
 For never have I seen such haggish creatures,
 or faces with such heinous features,
 and such a filthy stable as this one!
 Now tell me, hellish offspring, what is going on.

Clio

Before thou bluster look into this glass.
 (she leads him to a mirror)

Apollo

Confound it! Ha, who is this scrubby ass?
 It can't be me!

Clio

"Tis thou in bone and flesh
 just as we are the Muses, once so fair and fresh,
 now old, abused, raffish and violated,
 through modern art completely desiccated,
 and ineptly injured by thee to boot!
 (as Apollo examines the environment more closely)
 Dost thou not see? This is the institute
 in which began, it's more than sixty years
 ago, the Muses' sufferings and fears
 with bumptious stuff thou horribly hadst fetishized,
 and hadst as so-called naturalistic art devised.

Apollo

That is not true! I see no works here of the naturalistic art!

Clio

We carried them with joyful heart
 into the cellar where we bury cultural wastes
 which please sometimes an odd historian's tastes.
 Full sixty years hast slept thou in a row,
 and what has happened here thou dost not know.

Apollo

What, sixty years of sleep have you permitted me?
 If that is true you shall be punished, to that I'll see!

Clio

Drunk with thy naturalist conception
 hast slept thou there in deepest self-deception.
 We often tried to bring thee to thy feet;
 until this day it was in vain, indeed!

Apollo

Indeed a lovely story! Yet I wonder
from where you got then all this worthless plunder.
(*he points to the pieces of "art" around him*)

Clio

Whilst sleeping didst thou further us inspire
and hast us led into this awful mire.
By naturalism disappointed and deceived
hast in thy dreams thou new ideas conceived.
We heard thee loudly giving us directions
with which this plunder has direct connections.
Thus didst thou order after naturalism

expressionism,
cubism,
futurism,
surrealism,
existentialism,
neo-classicism,
abstractionism,
symbolism,
dilettantism,
infantilism,
cacophonism,
twelve-tone technicism;
not to forget Hemingwayism,

T. S. Eliot's criticism,

and primitivism with its many complications!
Spare me the details of still more vexations
but for this one: There on that rope
hangs a disaster of tremendous scope.
Nothing has given us so many dreadful pangs
As the pile of books which from the lustre hangs.
Its author has all others overreached,
has our bosoms tortured, squandered, leached.
No other living writer did us so much shame,
and thus I gave the present time this author's name.

Thalia

Remembr'st thou the business-offspring Thomas Mann
from Lübeck? (*she points to the rope*)

Well, there hast thou what he can!
Upon thy order were we bound to give him fame and rank;
see then: we never nursed a more preposterous crank.

(*Apollo takes from the uppermost line of the book-pile Mann's "Doctor Faustus" and sits silently down with it in his armchair. The Muses watch him intensely while he reads. After some time Apollo sighs in great pain, closes the book and, holding it in his hand, leans back.*)

Melpomene

Ha, how he ponders! heavy is his brain.
'T will not be long, then sleep has him again.²

Clio

That must not be! (*with loud voice*) Apollo, see our plight!
We cry for vengeance as our rightful right!

Thalia

We have been harder treated than the mangy dogs,
and now we stink like hundred rotten hogs.

All three (high pitched)

The time of Thomas Mann must fall to dust!
We cannot longer suffer modern art's creations.
United stand we here, solemnly to protest,
and would it file with the United Nations,
if the United Nations for their part
were not a fraud as gross as modern art.

Apollo

(*going threateningly towards the Muses*)
Ah, this is open un-American resistance!

The Muses (fearfully recoiling)
A l'aide! help!

Mephisto (quickly entering)

Don't fear! here comes assistance!

(*he steps between Apollo and the Muses*)
Since thou, Apoll', hast ended thy long sleep,³
and since I heard the Muses cry in desperation,
and since the arts have sunk so very deep,
appear I here for re-edification.

Apollo (ill-humored)

I take thy words but for a bad pretext:
to parody the Faustus is thy real intent!⁴

Mephisto

By Faustian mischief is the world still vexed,
and Faustian mischief too must find its end.

Apollo

Thou art subversive! didn't I banish thee?

² "The earth has me again" says Goethe's Faust when he refrains, under the influence of the *Chorus of Angels*, from committing suicide.

³ In Goethe's *Prologue* Mephisto makes his entry with the words: "Since thou, O Lord, approachest us once more. . . ."

⁴ The context appears from "Since thou . . .", etc. (See note 3.)

Mephisto

Yes, long ago! Thou didst no harm to me!

But for my promise: Look, how doth this blink!

(he points with his hand to the floor; a fountain comes up from which sparkling wine flows)

I did not here appear with false pretences.

(he takes "Doctor Faustus" from Apollo's hand and tosses it away)

Believe me that with such a drink

No-one can be in his right senses.

Drink from this fountain then at heart's desire:

No Eliot, no Thomas Mann comes ever near it!

It will thy spirit fill with warming fire,

and will thee show thy course and how to steer it.

Ye muses, drink! this wine calls for a truce!

Be full assured: It is a very special juice.⁵

Apollo and the Muses

(after having taken goblets from the fountain-rim and eagerly tasted the wine)

Ha, how this warms,
through the body swarms!

Our senses recover;

our bad mood is over;

our heart is delighted;

our soul is excited;

our blood runs not drowsy;

we feel no more lousy.

Hail to this liquor's
sound exhortation!

Hail to its truthful

exoneration! *

Apollo

All of a sudden I care not a bit

for "Doctor Faustus" and the other shit.

Still more: I would not give a damn

for all this artless modern sham.

The Muses

Refreshing tones,
persuasive ones!

Now what is swinish

we soon can drop;

what's eternally winish

draws us up;

the ugly deficient,

⁵ When Goethe's Mephisto demands that Faust must sign the pact with a drop of blood, he reasons: "Blood is a very special juice".

* All verses marked with * parody Goethe's manner of rhyming, of which the most abundant examples are to be found in the second part of his *Faust*.

approaches its end;
the forceful sufficient,
becomes event.⁶

Mephisto

The next step thus is to restore
that splendid shape which was your property
before the new course had the vogue
and ruined it to the distress of all.
Thyself, Apoll', see I with matted hair and beard,
and in the morning-gown which thou some sixty years ago
(it was then after all still new and clean
though made from worthless naturalistic stuff)
hast chosen and since then never laid off.
Ye, Muses, see I with the flabby bosom
and with the dungy feet which Thomas Mann invents
when hard he tries to picture stable-maids.⁷
About your raiment, hair, posteriors I'll not speak,
and not about this pig-sty where so many pompous asses,
so many poets, painters, sculptors, literati,
along with quacks in history, philosophy and politics,
have unchecked given you ill-usage.
To me have been of old by literature
attributed colossal powers;
and yet no poet and no writer has been able
such powers justly to apply. Alack!
they have with greedy hand well for my treasures dug,
yet have — like Mann — rejoiced if they but found
of what already Goethe's Faust spoke after Wagner's exit.⁸
So will I then the gifts I have been granted
use henceforth wholly in my proper manner,
and firstly terminante your lot just in that way
in which the object dies which has
among all earthly things the shortest life.

Apollo

Act quickly then, Mephisto, kindly tell us
what thing thou hast in mind and how it dies.

⁶ The *Chorus mysticus* which has the final say in Goethe's *Faust* (second part) utters: "The transient is but a parable; the insufficient [!] becomes here event; the indescribable has here been performed; the eternal feminine draws us up." That is mystical enough (isn't it?), and one must not believe that such insufficiency becomes a more sensible "event" if it is rendered in Goethe's rhymes or accompanied by textual comments.

⁷ Two stable-maids (cow-girls) figure in Thomas Mann's "Doctor Faustus" who are exhaustively characterized if we learn that they have "flabby bosoms" and "always dungy bare-feet", and that they resemble each other "as one stable-girl does just look like another". Thus "generalizes" this Goethe in pocket-size who probably in his whole life has never seen one single stable-maid.

⁸ Faust comments on his *filius*, Wagner, that men like him (vulgar minds), who "always cling to flat trash", "dig with greedy hand for treasures and rejoice if they earth-worms find".

As for myself I cannot guess
which thing the shortest life has, but I guess
that I shall burst if thou dost swiftly not proceed.

The Muses
Mephisto, quick!

Mephisto

Well, there we go!
(he parodies gestures of exorcism)
That Thomas Mann be null and null be hit!
Mark: *Lues non est epulis*, alas!⁹
The shortest life-time has the enema, to wit:
It says but Pffffft! and then dies in the arse.

(He approaches the rope on which Thomas Mann's works hang and imitates the handling of an enema: Pffffft! The rope breaks: Mann's works fall with a thunder-like noise to the floor and whirl up a tremendous cloud of dust. While the dust slowly settles down the scene changes into a magnificent garden-terrace. In the middle of it bubbles the wine-fountain from which Apollo, the Muses and Mephisto fill their goblets. Apollo and the Muses appear as divinely shaped beings: Apollo in a white toga, without beard; the Muses wear veils through which their beautiful bodies can be seen to the rapture of all non-hypocritical spectators.)

Apollo

Freed from the filth in which my stubbornness
had kept us for so long, I give thee thanks, Mephisto,
for thy good deed! Oh, had I ne'er in anger thee
banished from here that day when thou didst come
to caution me against my naturalist conception!
The deity itself must err if it to matters clings
which it creates in fits of weakness — if it
bows to the law of general inertia which it is destined
to hold in contempt. Oh, ye graceful Muses,
I feel how ardently you longed for this purge!
Abash'd stand I before you since I must confess:
The deity brings often in its obscure urge
the world into a complicated mess.¹⁰

Clio

For me have been these sixty years of history
the reign of crime and mediocrity.

⁹ Allusion to the "perfect" nonsense produced by Goethe's witch when she recites her "one-time-one".

¹⁰ In Goethe's *Prologue* the Lord, after having granted Mephisto the freedom to lead Faust the "downward course" if he can get hold of him, adds: "And stand abashed if thou hast to confess: A good man, in his obscure urge, is of the right way well aware nevertheless". Goethe, however, fails to prove the Lord's point: Faust's (pseudo-) salvation is by no means due to his awareness of the right way, but poor Mephisto (for he is, after all, a poor, limited devil!) loses Faust through an act of cheating committed by — Goethe.

Where greatness did appear, it was annoyed,
reduced to silence or outright destroyed.

Melpomene

For me were seriousness and tragedy
not more than highly trivial comedy.
And those who wrote about heaven and hell
had the worst products of all to sell.
Longing for death and Wertherism
became the stock for low mercantilism.
Fate, sickness and compassion not less
went into commercial franticness.¹¹

Thalia

For me were jest and comedy
not more than flatulent tragedy.
The most tormenting part in that affliction
played Thomas Mann with his fictitious fiction.
As often as he wrote about his humor and his irony,
I was compelled to vomit and wept bitterly.

Clio

But pains have meaning only if they are acute:
We moaned when our bosoms were so flat and dry.
Thanks to Mephisto are we now in splendid mood
and say to what once happened heartily good-bye.

Melpomene

'T is true, we have been basely treated, deeply grieved.
A great expenditure — disgraceful! — has been wasted!¹²
Thanks to Mephisto are we now relieved
and ready to forget what once so bitter tasted.

Thalia

Oh, new aurora, new elevation!
Deliverance from pompous modern cant!
A thousand times more genuine is this salvation
than that of Faustus by old Goethe's sleight of hand.¹³

¹¹ Concerning the last four verses: "Longing for death" (*Sehnsucht nach dem Tode*) or "the sympathy for disease and death" together with "amor fati" and similar junk were, above all, exploited by Thomas Mann, while the other great zero, Gerhart Hauptmann, nourished himself mainly with "compassion". — The German word "Weltschmerz" (world-woe or weariness of life) is sometimes translated into English as "Wertherism", derived from Goethe's "The sufferings of young Werther" which was the first "great" piece of "Weltschmerz" and caused at its time an epidemic of suicide among young men.

¹² Exclamation of Goethe's Mephisto who blames himself after (in reality) having been cheated by his — author.

¹³ See note 10, last sentence.

All three

Oppression, fear and gloom are banished,
of filth, abuse and slavery are we quit.
The time of Thomas Mann has quickly vanished
and modern art will us no longer twit.

With justice achieved
we dismiss our grudge;
profoundly relieved
we gladly judge:

Still longer to quarrel would not be right:
Peace must be concluded after the fight!

(they shake hands with Apollo, who beams with pleasure, and embrace him)

Mephisto (to the Muses)

Felicità! you speak no longer in the stupid strain
of Goethe's angels! — earth has you again.¹⁴

Clio (to Mephisto)
Escaped from the hardship
in which many a scamp
and the masters of swank
long held us in wardship,
we feel in thy presence
pleasant sensation:
Renewed essence
wants fecundation! *

Melpomene

Thou who us movest,
fidelity provest,
brotherhood holdeth
and life unfoldeth: *

Restored hast thou for us lust, reason and fruition!
Gratefully are we at thy disposition!

Thalia

With love and skill
didst thou fulfill
our ardent request,
and thus we attest: *

To all thy wishes we gladly will submit!
He whom we love may do as he sees fit!

All three

Muses enraptured,
to love dedicated,
want to be captured
and impregnated.

¹⁴ See note 2.

Kiss and seduce us
in heavenly thrill;
children produce us
at random and will! *

(they embrace Mephisto and kiss him in turn lengthily)

Apollo (meanwhile)
Muses in blossom,
to whom you lend
your swelling bosom
will never repent.
Through you what's persistent
painless fades;
through you what is transient
ever pervades.
And so united
lives one in the other:
blest and delighted
sister and brother.*¹⁵

Mephisto

(who would be quite willing to return the caresses of the Muses in all ways)

Enough for now! If I am mightily attracted
by your caresses and your godly beauty,
do not forget: The Prologue must be further acted
and must run smoothly — such is here our duty!
And that's not all: We are here in the public grip!
So many people look upon the stage!
There in the background even lurks the censorship
and is already in misgiving rage.
The pureness of the mores, says she, have I to protect!
Where lust she finds she calls for the police.
And where a good example could have good effect
will she decide: The thing is very much amiss.
Yes, all the joys she in the mire drags;
even ye Muses does she ram that filthy shell,
hypocrisy, between your admirable legs
as if she had there seen but blackest hell.
Just now has she decided: Child-producing
will ne'er be fitted for publicity;
the very things which are so sweet, seducing,
have to be executed but in secrecy.
So, please, be patient till the curtain here will fall,
then shall I lead ye to a wondrous and enchanting place;
and if the public makes no noise at all
't will hear in spite of censorship what the reformed old Goethe says:
(he gives a sign with his hand; one hears from behind the scene)

¹⁵ Compare note 6: "The transient. . . ."

Chorus of the knowing women

Juicy arrows will join you here;
 fiery lances toy with you here;
 warming thighs knead well you here;
 charming lightnings will till you here;
 your lovely bosoms will be caressed;
 your rapturous mouths with tenderness blest;
 your behinds will be fondled, not cruelly shattered!
 your most sexual part immensely flattered;
 your arms and your hands and your ravishing feet,
 your eyes, your cheeks and your necks, so sweet!
 your wombs and your backs and your legs, so divine!
 your noses and ears, so rosy and fine!
 will feel here how life in felicity flows
 beyond lying morals and censorship's blows;
 so that nothingness,
 Faustian rottenness,
 incompetence,
 impertinence,
 moon-struck paleness,
 arrogant staleness
 completely evaporate,
 you nevermore violate! * ¹⁶

Mephisto

Now to the point we come, for much is missing
 to give reconquered youthfulness stability.
 Ah, all beginning is as easy as kissing,
 it is almost an act of spontaneity.
 Much harder is the work's continuation
 and to complete it well in time and space;
 most difficult is such a combination
 that start and end are one, and senseful interlace.
 Thus easy 't was to terminante the time of Thomas Mann
 for you in literary heaven's region;
 the problem now is how on earth to ban
 horrors and evils which are truly legion.

(He opens a trap-door in the floor and lets Apollo look through it upon the earth. An indescribable noise of atom bomb-explosions, cannons, rockets, airplanes, automobiles, sirens, screams of anguish, jazz-music, etc., etc., is heard.)

Apollo

Ha, what a show! and not only a show! ¹⁷

¹⁶ The extent to which Goethe (or his nonsensical rhyming) has here been "reformed" can only be measured by readers well acquainted with the second part of *Faust*. One small sample may give an idea of what is involved, namely four verses taken from those recited by *Pater ecstaticus* who (modern psychology: attention!) asks for the following: "Arrows, pierce me; / lances, subdue me; / clubs, crush me; / lightnings, weather-beat me."

¹⁷ Goethe's *Faust*: "What a show! but ah! only a show!"

According to its unimpeded proper law
 runs madness there as never I have seen.
 It seems that mankind is bereft of all its brain!
 To some degree of foolishness we always lean,
 but that is totally insane.
 And what offensive smells come up — woe to our noses!
 It stinks like tons of shit and boiling pitch.

(Mephisto closes the trap-door; all breathe in great relief)

Compared to that it was the smell of roses
 which came from Goethe's kitchen of the witch.

Mephisto

'T is but too true! the world has, since old Goethe died,
 been more and more on the declining side.
 Incomparably worse is now poor mankind's plight:
 It may one of these days well commit suicide,
 forced by a system truly Faustian, marked by deceit.
 Only a few will say in earnest they enjoy it.
 Never in history a system has been such a cheat,
 and yet only a few can grasp how to destroy it.

Apollo

Anew feel I ashamed I have to own:
 The Muses, see I, are familiar with this all;
 but I, the chief, have nothing of it known,
 and learn but now how deep has been my fall.
 I must rely, Mephisto, on thy guiding hand,
 for what has happened I don't understand.

Mephisto

Thou know'st that since the time of Goethe evermore has spread
 the competition which into the Faustian madness led.
 But what thou sawest was not as crazy as it is today:
 Today this competition is in every field employed!
 At present is humanity its helpless prey,
 perhaps tomorrow is the world by it destroyed.
 Yes, it is competition which brings mankind to disaster
 (whilst it is fooled with progress, the official creed!)
 and forces it to freeze and starve where it is master
 of riches in excess of any human need.
 This is the situation, brief and axiomatic:
 Humanity could live happily free and saturated
 and lives just therefore in a way that's maddeningly pragmatic!

Apollo

It seems to me that Goethe should have formulated:
 "I tell thee this: A churl who does compete
 is like an animal which some ill spirit leads
 from beautiful and highly verdant meads

into a barren heath and direst need.”¹⁸
 I further see that competition’s deepest being
 in Goethe’s *Faust* is incarnated:
 Faustus has studied, acted, preached without believing,
 and finally is into heaven elevated,
 because he had just always striven —
 regardless with what means and to which ends.¹⁹

Thalia

Into whatever misdeeds he was driven,
 the world of spirits him great honor lends,
 because old Goethe, lacking better inclination,
 did thus prescribe for public delectation.
 Then even “love from above”, a pure ghost,
 takes part in poetical cheating,
 and orders the angels’ babbling host
 to the official greeting.²⁰
 As if the “love from above” were not
 the love from below in perversion,
 and the chit-chat in rhymes were not a lot
 of tomfoolish conversion.²¹

Apollo

When we a word from Goethe hear we readily believe
 there must be with it something to conceive.²²
 I see: Where striving as such rules the day
 all sense must soon pale and wither away.²³

¹⁸ Goethe’s Mephisto to Faust: “I tell thee this: A churl who speculates [in the philosophical sense!] is like an animal on a barren heath led in a circle by an ill spirit, while all around lie beautiful and verdant meads”.

¹⁹ Goethe’s angels who carry Faust’s “immortal” part away proclaim: “He who always troubles himself to strive [just to strive, nothing more!] can be salvaged by us”. This is the kernel of Goethe’s cheating (his intellectual “sleight of hand”) — the rest of Faust’s “salvation” is involuntary comedy of the worst kind, a bad *coup de théâtre*.

²⁰ Goethe’s angels, after having proclaimed whom they can “salvage”, continue to explain that if “even love has from above taken part in it [!], the blessed host [the angels themselves] meet him with a hearty welcome”. Absolutely unclear remains to what the word “it” refers, for there is no subject in the whole nonsense except Faust’s “immortal part”, and that love has taken part in it (or *on it*, if you wish!) “from above” improves the nonsense not one iota. (Besides: If what Goethe rhymes sound awkward in English — there was no other way to render the nonsense in its true calibre.)

²¹ To sum it up: The entire set of verses at the end of Goethe’s *Faust* is poetical cheating which diverts the reader’s attention from the — sleight of hand. The result is a tomfoolery — Faust’s conversion in favor of an extremely cheap theology which is of concern to Goethe, but has no connection with his Faust as the “salvaged” hero.

²² Goethe’s Mephisto to Faust: “Men, if they hear but words, in general believe there must be with them something to conceive”.

²³ Apollo expands here (as does Clio in the following verses) on the point that the *deepest essence of competition is incarnated in Goethe’s Faust*. Faust’s striving for the sake of striving (or striving as such, abstract striving) is the perfect ideological image of the capitalist mode of production which results under the compulsory laws of competition in *production for the sake of production*, not for the satisfaction of human needs.

Clio

Indeed, where one strives but for striving's sake
and the system as such makes the season,
there thinking and poetry are at stake
and proceed without rhyme or reason.

Melpomene

And if in time the rhyming falls short,
then clings one to hackneyed prose
with which the writers of every sort
as geniuses will pose.

At the very end comes high-brow naught, pretentious emptiness:
Herr Thomas Mann and his self-styled Goethian haughtiness.

Mephisto

This truly is a point of great dismay,
and is the system's vicious jeering:
A garbage-can, a lumber-room, a lot of smearing
and not an act of consequence in all the play.²⁴
A syphilitic musicker now Faustus represents
(with much of Nietzsche's traits) and must all love decline,
because this Thomas Mann's pragmatic sentiments
dictate that outright dullness suits him very fine.
If Faust of yore was not a lifeless shade,
here is one fabricated of sheer paper-paste
who gives the world from oldest stock in trade
his petty groans and moans of miserable taste,
and entertains in Mann's specific way
(Mann thinks that will affect us others)
the typical delusive Goethian spray:
a mad relation with the shadowy mothers.²⁵

²⁴ Goethe's Wagner speaks to Faust of the great pleasure "of transporting oneself into the spirit of past ages, to see how before us a wise man has thought and how splendidly we finally have progressed". Faust answers: "Oh yes! we reached the stars so far! / To us, my friend, the ages that are passed / a closed book with seven seals but are; / and what the spirit of the times you call, / is certain Messieurs spirit after all, / wherein the times themselves are glassed. / Then truly is it oft a great dismay! / At the first glance people run away. / A garbage-can, a lumber-room, and for the rest / a grand historical event at best."

²⁵ What the "mothers" are neither Goethe nor Thomas Mann nor the numerous commentaries on Goethe's *Faust* (second part) can tell us. Faust himself (who shudders when Mephisto pronounces the word "mothers") says: "The mothers! mothers! — it sounds so queer!" And it is queer, replies Mephisto, for the mothers are goddesses, unknown to mortals and not readily mentioned by immortals; around them is no place, still less a time, and no way leads to them. Nevertheless, Mephisto gives Faust a little key which will scent out the right place. Faust is to follow the key *down* and will be led to the mothers. Now, while he goes down, he will in eternal empty distance *see nothing*, not hear his step, and find nothing solid where he rests, yet he will have to swing the key in order to fight off what has long passed away (he will even enjoy it) and which whirls around like a passage of the clouds. Finally a red-hot trivet will give him notice that he has arrived at the deepest, nay, the very deepest ground. Then he will see in the shine of the trivet the mothers, some sitting, some standing, some walking, just as it comes to pass. The mothers, for their part, will not see Faust, for

Thalia

Mann makes him first theology try
(such is the Faustian tradition),
and then he leads him by and by
to music and to composition;
and writes for him, thus cooking the hash,
a dozen pieces in modern fashion,
and tells us he loves this prosaic trash
as he loves Faust with faithful passion.

Melpomene

His musical pieces are unheard of
because nobody can hear them;
they are but bad literary stuff:
No ear has ever to fear them.

Clio

Mann surely prates a lot of instruments and music,
of twelve-tone system, singing, orchestration;
but we would get from any worn-out broom stick
the self-same silent musical sensation.

Mephisto

Could feel the world that this is easy hocus-pocus,
how shallow mankind's fate has there been drawn,
it would at once round healthy laughter focus,
when spoken music by Herr Mann runs on its own.

The Muses

Hearken! and be well admonished:
Soundless now, for mental ears,
Faust-cantata interferes —
all the ears are much astonished!
Kettle-drum-sticks rustle dashing,
drum-heads creak and rattle smashing,
cymbals clash,
pianos crash,
viols weep,
basses sweep,

they see only phantoms, but he must summon up courage (because the "danger is great"), must go straight to that trivet and touch it with the key. And then? Well, that is literally all we ever learn about the "mothers" and Faust's encounter with them, for Faust appears later quite simply with the trivet and produces in the name of the mothers Paris and Helen for the amusement of the emperor and his court. Whilst doing so, however, he becomes terribly jealous of Paris and falls in love with Helen who blesses him later with a son. And that is enough for Thomas Mann to entertain a life-long relationship with the "mothers" and to tell us in the description of the *Faust-cantata* which his Faust has (even in the framework of fiction: allegedly, because the *cantata* exists only as a *description in prose*) "composed": "There are faint reminiscences of Orphic lamentation, which make Orpheus and Faust brothers as invokers of the world of shades: as in that episode where Faust summons Helen, who is to bear him a son."

fiddles groan,
celli moan,
tubas grumble,
church-bells rumble;
piccolo and clarinet
cry as if they colic had;
French horns, cembalo and harp
help to make the noises sharp;
hautboy, castanet and flute
make the din still more acute.

Mephisto

The mocking bassoons seem to tell us, however,
that all this fuming and roaring endeavor
is spineless swindle from top to ground:
If trumpets blare loud and trombones speak thunder,
the eyes will blink and the ears will wonder
because of the noise you hear not one sound.

Thalia

Even dummies (isn't that cute?)
will remain thoroughly mute
if such musical event
comes to its *adagio*-end,
which us also soundless feeds,
at its very end then leads
to the high G of a cello —

Mephisto

solo-tone e molto bello! —

Thalia

which now slowly dies away,
but in spite of that will stay;
for so leaving us
indeed it ends,
whilst persisting thus
it "changes the sense,
abides as a light in the night".²⁶

²⁶ After having described all the noise caused by his *Faust-cantata* (especially that of the "awful ballet-music of the descent to hell"), Mann says that the *end* of the *cantata* is "a symphonic *adagio*, into which the chorus of lament, opening powerfully [naturally!] after the inferno-galop [we are indeed in a circus!], gradually passes over". But the *end* of the *cantata* must be well distinguished from its *very end* which Mann describes as follows: "For listen to the end, listen with me: one group of instruments after another retires, and what remains, as the work fades on the air [he means on paper!], is the high G of a cello, the last word [indeed!], the last fainting sound, slowly dying in a *pianissimo-fermata*". Now, if we all have carefully "listened" to the high G of that cello and have mastered our profound "emotion" caused by an "ending" which has hundreds of predecessors, we are well aware of the fact that after the *very end*, when the high G has slowly

Mephisto

Thus nowadays the night-lights shine bright!

The Muses

Horrid it is if we must borrow;
more horrid is to eat a frying-pan;
and yet the peak of horror and sorrow
that is the Faustus by Thomas Mann!
As long as this Faustus has not vanished
and competition not been banished,
we Muses too will not be well
and not in benignant fertility dwell.

Mephisto

That hits the mark: You would soon be again
an object of pity and utmost disdain!
Where blind and senseless powers strive
life cannot unfold and happily thrive;
if all around it receives a rough time
the arts will be nothing but nonsense and slime.
And then reigns the scum, the artistical ring,
which organizes the racket,
and according to endless prescriptions will bring
their repulsive stuff to the market.
So they bereave, to cook their ragout,
life of its last little flame,
and throw what they artless together glue
into the competitive game.

Apollo

What thou hast said makes sense and is well contemplated —
a true solution, seems to me, can thus be formulated:
Bring life and art, which have so long been separated,
anew together into one big, all-embracing frame!

Mephisto

True! every evil is in principle negated
as soon as we can call it by its proper name.
And so I will the negation start
with Thomas Mann and with his art
in which all other evils are combined.

Apollo

What is Mann's essence more precisely defined?

died in its pianissimo-fermata, silence must result and nothing more will be "heard". Thomas Mann uses his "logic" and adds in the most convincing tone: "Then nothing more: silence, and night." And then he continues: "But [!] that tone which vibrates in the silence, which is no longer there, to which only the spirit hearkens, and which was the voice of mourning, is so no more. It changes the sense, abides as a light in the night." Yes, and there are people who "listen" to that light with great delight!

Mephisto

He's part of that force which thinks it induces
always the highest, but garbage produces;²⁷
which aims at immortality and fame,
but only exposes its naked shame.

He looks for what the soul can bind²⁸
with empty phrases, spurious tales;
seeks what distracts the reader's mind
from consequences he entails.

He always seeks the high opinion
on which the vulgar spirits feed;
he seeks delusion, seeks dominion,
drops to this end his former creed.
He seeks for what is simulated,
speaks much of love, humanity;
he always will be stimulated
by business-opportunity.

He seeks the mammon, which to hunt
has ever been his deepest pleasure;
will shout undignified lament
if he has lost some of his treasure.²⁹
He tries whatever serves his aims
and will declare his wrongs are good;
advances truly tasteless claims
and tries men's patience thus to boot.

²⁷ Goethe's Mephisto replies to Faust's question who he is: "Part of that force which always evil schemers and always creates what is good".

²⁸ The following verses allude to (and parody) the verses with which Goethe's Faust curses the world, translated by Anna Swanwick as follows:

So curse I all, around the soul that windeth
Its magic and alluring spell,
And with delusive flattery bindeth
Its victim to this dreary cell!
Curs'd before all things be the high opinion,
Wherewith the spirit girds itself around!
Of shows delusive curs'd be the dominion,
Within whose mocking sphere our sense is bound!
Accurs'd of dreams the treacherous wiles,
The cheat of glory, deathless fame!
Accurs'd what each as property beguiles,
Wife, child, slave, plow, whate'er its name!
Accurs'd be mammon, when with treasure
He doth to daring deeds incite:
Or when to steep the soul in pleasure,
He spreads the couch of soft delight!
Curs'd be the grape's balsamic juice!
Accurs'd love's dream, of joys the first!
Accurs'd be hope! accurs'd be faith!
And more than all, be patience curs'd!

²⁹ Among all the German anti-Nazis (with and without quotation marks) who suffered material losses, Thomas Mann was the only one who repeatedly lamented in public about his "lost property" in the most repulsive manner. He even wrote to the Nazi ministry of the Interior, concerning this "worthy subject", a letter which still awaits analysis.

Apollo

Me seems a new force then we need, a being who does not aspire high, but solid work will do.

Mephisto

Indeed, a man who acts with due reflection; who manysided is, yet has no Faustian notion; the limits sees of knowledge and perfection, and yet to both will cling in deep devotion. Who never shuns true human tragedy, but never longs for what is inaccessible; enjoys the moment full, with sensitivity, yet never is to the moment's whims submissile. Who scorns the scientific guilds with vehemence, but holds that science is men's great reliance; who is philosopher and even understands the man with whom he lives in sharp defiance. Who where he errs and where he fails not vainly will defend his wrong, and ne'er on friend or foe entails the blunders which to him belong. Who feud in public deems imperative where swindle, fraud, oppression reign, yet finds delicious self-relief in dropping hatred and disdain. Who strong in will, mentally clean, works for his aim with steadfastness, and will for cover never lean on self-describing shamelessness.³⁰ Who deeply senses mankind's pain and honors other people's griefs, but has for soul-searching no strain and shares no Freudian beliefs. Who never has relished his own torments with two souls lodg'd within one single breast,³¹ and has no hypocritical comments on joys for which he is himself in quest. Who will in struggles firmly stand his ground, yet loves the element in whose inspiring stream the ego dies away, serenely bound to be consumed in self-forgotten dream. Who cultivates his earthly pleasures in intellect and bodily,

³⁰ The autobiographical shamelessness in the tradition of Rousseau's by far not always reliable "Confessions" is by its very nature a device with which fundamental defects are "covered" and, in the last analysis, vindicated. The degree of degeneration which even such a dubious device has suffered in the hands of Thomas Mann (who loves no other word so much as the word "self-confession") forms a chapter in itself.

³¹ Goethe's Faust relishes his torments and exclaims: "Two souls, alas! are lodg'd within my breast."

but never any hatred treasures
if one declines his company.
Who never sullies what was his delight,
nor rues past raptures even if the woman
who fervently embraced him still the other night
today him cuts unfeelingly, inhuman.
Who holds that bitterness and frankness
have civil rights, are no offence,
just as derision, bluntness, sharpness,
if not employed for smutty ends.
And yet whose blood will quickly boil
where baseness e'er comes into play;
who will be mute, coldly recoil
where has vulgarity its say.
Whom ill behavior, coarseness, lewdness
rouse to spontaneous opposition,
and who venality, malice, rudeness,
fights on the spot, without condition.
In short: A man solidly grounded,
self-conscious, proud, alert and wise,
yet modest too, humanly rounded,
who word and deed identifies.

Apollo

On such a man I gladly would bestow my favors!
Say, lives there one who in this manner labors?

Mephisto

There lives a certain Baldrian Leberkäs'³²
who educates himself and works as I have indicated;
he is a man who merits highest praise
because his life and deeds are fully vindicated.
His name as such already points to parody
on Adrian Leverkühn, whom Thomas Mann invented
when he his grossest literary fallacy,
his tenth-hand Faustus to the world presented.
This Leberkäse thus have I selected:
He shall the Faustian madness in the world destroy;
shall show how Thomas Mann has public life infected,
and shall restore the world to health and joy.
He shall the modern artists' fraudulence unmask
and shall their paltry fantasy abash,
when first they speak about their godlike task
and then deliver their incongruous trash.
And he shall mock the literary rabble
that grasps whatever comes its way,

³² The name "Leberkäse" (meaning Livercheese) if written without the final *e* (Läberkäs') corresponds in pronunciation to *Laborcase*, but if the final *e* is not suppressed it must be pronounced like a short *e* as for instance in the English word *bed*.

and sells the new-dyed oldest gabble
to foolish readers day by day.
And finally he shall to it reveal:
The spirit of the world you do not understand!
Your private problems, your commercial deal,
is all the spirit you can comprehend.

Apollo

That's what I call a program! Let's no longer then delay!
Bring us thy Leberkäse quickly on the scene!
The public cries already for thy newest play:
't is long ago that it has something worthwhile seen.

Mephisto (to the public)

I beg you heartily to grant a longer intermission!
You all have heard what I did promise to the Muses.
Since in this house are not permitted certain uses
lead I my darlings now away with your permission.
Apollo in his eagerness has not reflected:
The Muses must be first inspired with affection;
if here a new play shall be well effected,
they cannot do without a new conception.
And if you ask what will Apollo do if I now exercise his function
and in his place the Muses shall caress, inspire and protect:
Don't mind, he will not suffer from the new conjunction,
he has indeed delicious pleasures to collect.
He did not think of it, but him awaits a maid of highest worth:
'T is the New Time, the greatest beauty ever seen on earth.
Quite undetected grew she up at old time's edge;
with her consent I took her from her mother as my loot.
She greets Apoll, in freedom and my word I pledge:
she is in full possession of her maidenhood!

(Upon a movement of his hand there appears in the background the New Time as a tender blossoming maid who smiles at Apollo. The Muses approach her in unenvious admiration and embrace her like a sweetheart.)

Apollo (enchanted)

By the fountain which so graceful
has from downfall us relieved;
by the stature which so blissful
has perfection there achieved:
Never have I been so keen
to fulfill my duty!
Be thou virgin, mother, queen,
I fall for thy beauty.
Burning passion seizes me
at thy tender smile!
All my time I will with thee
faithfully beguile.*
(to Mephisto)

Where powers so divine interfere
 remains but capitulation;
 where such seducing times appear
 I must care for my reputation.

Ah, could I be alone with her to execute my mission!
 I beg myself now for that longer intermission.

Mephisto

So let us bring the prologue to its happy end!
 When all thy senses to their duty rouse,
 and if we all shall profit from the great event,
 thou must not come to shipwreck at this public house!
 Go, leave the stage! I'll soon be at your side!

(*to the public, while Apollo with the New Time and the Muses go to the background for exit*)

They will experience the fourth Reich's, not the third Reich's tide!
 You do not know yet how in that new fortunate realm
 the phony tests which Goethe's Faustus overwhelm

become tests full of raptures
 which the lover captures;
 which are not distressing,
 but constantly blessing;
 not poetic stupidity,
 but refined assiduity;
 not direfully spiritistic,
 but truly realistic;
 not pure imagination,
 but carnal realization.*

Tests, I should say, which are of highest class
 and which we must without the help of angels pass.
 I would be glad to show you all these tests in execution
 if that were possible — it pains my heart:
 You have not yet the fourth Reich's constitution
 and cannot on the spot with us depart.

(*whilst the curtain falls*)

So long then, friends! see there, the curtain cuts us off!
 You know well why! We'll greet again each other soon enough!

—

THE USES OF CIVIL DEFENSE*

1. Tintinabulation : Bells, Bells, Bells

9th November, 1954.

The bells rang Wednesday and everybody looked annoyed and milled around the halls for a while. After a while the bells rang again and everybody breathed a sigh of relief and went back into their rooms. The officials announced that the air raid drill was a success, a few people gathered statistics about something, and, as usual, everyone forgot about it.

To say that the drill was unusually ineffectual would be an understatement. It amounted to nothing more than an unwelcome annoyance. No one knew what was going on, except a few of the inner circle, and few were interested.

2. Huddling in Corridors

12th November, 1954.

To the Editor:

Of course the Civil Defense drills about which you commented in yesterday's editorial should be conducted as efficiently as possible as long as they are held. However I am afraid that the apathy toward them (which is felt by the general public as well as students) is not without its justification. For this is the age of the Hydrogen Bomb, one of which can by blast, fire, and especially radiation destroy any city on earth, and a mere handful of which, according to *Newsweek* magazine, rendered an area about the size of Connecticut uninhabitable last spring. Even the English city of Coventry which was nearly destroyed during the Second World War has ended its drills in protest at their ineffectiveness, and I fear that their sole function in America is to delude us into thinking that by huddling together in corridors we can escape the deadliness of the weapons that we and the Russians are preparing for our mutual destruction, and induce public apathy about whether or not they are controlled.

Robert Ilson.

3. Answers Bomb Stopper

19th November, 1954.

To the Editor:

The following is in answer to the letter published in your "Letters" column on page 2 of the Friday, November 12, 1954 issue. A Mr. Robert Ilson was the contributor.

One thing that Mr. Ilson overlooked in his "let's all give up" attitude toward Civil Defense (capital letters if you please) and air raid drills was the fact that wherever a bomb may drop, regardless of the size or destructive power of the bomb, there will always be a fringe area where damage and injuries have been slight, moderate or heavy, while not resulting in total destruction or complete loss of life.

*Reprinted from *Square Bulletin*, a newspaper published by students of New York University. Part of an editorial appears first.

Who will take care of Mr. Ilson and his friends and relatives in such a case if we take his pessimistic attitudes seriously? Who will rescue him from a pile of debris under which he lies helpless? Who will put out the fire that is destroying his home? Who will render medical aid to him?

If we don't hold drills, how will Mr. Ilson know where to go to protect himself from blast, flying glass, radiation and fire, except by instinct and disorder?

Nothing Civilian Defense forces could do would protect him from a direct blast, but after all, nobody hates him personally (?) and it is possible he could be in a fringe area hard hit while at school during a sneak attack — or for that matter, any other civil emergency.

It is suggested that Mr. Ilson consult President Eisenhower, top generals in the Army, Civil Defense, police and fire chiefs for his information and not Newsweek magazine and the lone city of Coventry, England. Newsweek COULD be wrong, you know.

I sincerely hope that Mr. Ilson — and others who share his feelings — will never have to see the day when they will regret their attitude toward their own safety and the welfare of their friends and relatives!

A Student and Civil Defense Worker.
(name withheld by request).

4. More Civil Defense

23rd November, 1954.

To the Editor:

Your pro-Civil Defense correspondent, who was so delightfully shy about the use of his name (for nobody hates him personally) disputes none of my facts about the H-Bomb's destructiveness. But he raises two points in opposition to me: that there is a "fringe" area where loss of life will not be complete, and that I am a pessimist. Unfortunately he is wrong on the first count, and fortunately he is wrong on the second. For widespread as are the effects of its blast and fire, the Bomb covers a far wider area with poisonous radioactivity. INS reported on March 27 that the Bomb the Atomic Energy Commission exploded on March 1 completely destroyed everything within a radius of 14 miles. But Akechi Kuboyama was killed by radioactivity 80 miles from the explosion. The *New York Times* reported soon after the March 1 test that the AEC had set a new "hazard" area for subsequent tests: 445,000 square miles — an area greater than the area of all the states of our Atlantic Seaboard, from Maine to Florida. My original citation of *Newsweek* magazine may indeed have erred — on the side of conservatism.

Civil Defense drills are no defense at all against radioactivity; and *there is no cure for radioactivity poisoning*. Everybody who *might* be killed by blast and fire *will* be killed by radiation — and many more besides.

But I am no pessimist. Stripped of the illusions of security that "Civil Defense" provides, we may begin to *realistically* consider the problem of the monstrous weapons we and the Kremlin dictators possess, and insofar as we are closer to reality, our solutions will be closer to success.

I shall consider the absence of a reply to this letter an indication of surrender.

Robert Ilson.

5. Civil Defense

To the Editor:

(In answer to a letter from Robert Ilson in the November 23 issue of BULLETIN.)

Civil defenses are a defense against radio-activity, because they enable you to get the practice of securing shelter. When an attack is expected, and if you secure shelter, you will be putting some material between you and the blast. And as a result mostly all of the harmful radiation would be stopped, except in areas which would be relatively close to "ground zero" where some radiation may penetrate the protective barrier. However, the amount of deaths caused by the radiation of atomic or hydrogen weapons would be the least.

Time magazine said that the Japanese fishermen who were burned by "death ash" were apparently victims of a local concentration of contaminated pulverized coral. Some of the burns came from a chemical action of the ash.

This "death ash" consists of billions of fragments or pieces of atoms split up in the explosion and acting as ordinary dust. In an air burst, however, practically all of the radio-active ashes and unexploded bits of bomb fuel would be carried off harmlessly in drifting bomb clouds, and very little would ever reach the earth.*

Hydrogen bombs will not blow the earth apart or kill us all by radio activity, as you may think, because their overall power has very definite limits. Naturally, with the H-bomb there will be more extensive damage and more people killed, but the basic idea for civil defense still remains the same, and that is to have the ability to fight back. The people of Nagasaki and Hiroshima did not have the ability to fight back, because proper civil defense was not organized. As a result, many people were killed and needlessly hurt because of panic. Thousands were left homeless with no one to care for them. The wounded and helpless who might have lived died because there was no civil defense. We need civil defense so this cannot happen here. And if one area is attacked that area can expect help from other areas not affected. But if we accept the attitude of defeatism, then we will surely be doomed.

You, sir, have definitely accepted the attitude of surrender, or you do not know the facts.

William J. Valley
(23 Precinct, P.D.)
Civil Defense New York.

6. Bombs Away

7th January, 1955.

To the Editor:

In contradiction to Mr. Valley's citation of *Time* Magazine the Alsop Brothers report in the *Herald-Tribune* that "fall-out" from the spring tests

* This is not true. Some of the particles remain active for many years, and any of them may fall anywhere on earth at any time. The general effects of Atomic and Hydrogen explosions are discussed in No. 20 and No. 22 of *Contemporary Issues*.

was distributed fairly evenly over a diamond-shaped area whose dimensions were about 100 miles by 100 miles; the "Fukuryu Maru" was 80 miles from the explosion.

Almost as if in direct reply to Mr. Valley's other arguments of Dec. 22 for the efficacy of Civil Defense, Dr. Ralph E. Lapp in the November 1954 "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" estimates that a 15 megaton Hydrogen Bomb exploding "close to the ground" (not on the ground) will expose everybody who stays within 4,000 square miles of the explosion for 1 day to a "serious to lethal amount" of radioactivity. Next fall the US intends to explode a 45 megaton Bomb.

Therefore for shelters to be effective against radioactivity everybody within 4,000 square miles of the explosion of a "small" H-Bomb must stay in them not for 3 or 4 minutes, but for at least a day. All life must stop during that time. The obvious absurdity of this scheme leads Lapp to a currently popular conclusion — mass evacuation.

These estimates may well err on the side of conservatism, for "US News and World Report" warns (April 9) that if only 1 bomb is dropped everyone within 175 to 200 miles "might have to be evacuated".

But any scheme for mass evacuation demands state control over the entire population of totalitarian dimensions. If possible, it is monstrous; if not, it is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole idea of Civil Defense drills.

Their purpose, as Mr. Valley admits, is not humanitarian but essentially military. They cannot protect people against the H-Bomb's wrath. But they will serve the function of helping to turn people into more efficient and of course less human fighting machines.

Robert Ilson.

MATERIAL AND DOCUMENTS

I. LEVANTINE INSOLENCE*

THE new crisis in French-Egyptian relations, its sources and backgrounds, provides a highly instructive lesson in how not to deal with the Arab League governments. Why is the Cairo junta not in the least afraid to organize terrorist bands in Algeria, to train their leaders, to supply arms, to call them to revolt over the "Voice of the Arabs" broadcast of the Cairo radio? We can go on to ask: Why does the Cairo junta (and the Arab League in general) not dare to call, say the Uzbek of Uzbekistan to revolt, though the political situation *vis-à-vis* Moscow is similar? Why do the ambassadors of the Arab countries lodge their protests in Washington and London against the presentation of credentials by the American and

* Editorial from the *Jerusalem Post*, 15th November, 1954. The answer by Mr. Koussa which follows was not published by the newspaper.

British diplomatic envoys — and why would it never enter their heads to make similar protest, say in Moscow or Belgrade, though the Russian and Yugoslav envoys acted in exactly the same way?

The reply to all these questions is fairly obvious: They do it because Western diplomats have decided that the Arab League representatives should be treated like European statesmen and gentlemen, not like Levantine adventurers, cowardly and servile when faced by firmness, impertinent and even insolent if they feel weakness and a willingness to compromise — and they have an excellent nose for that. They know very well that even if their "protest" on the presentation of credentials is not accepted, they will probably receive some compensation, because after all the gentlemen from Cairo and Damascus must not be offended. And thus lack of firmness toward the Arab rulers will create more and more difficulties for the West rather than an "atmosphere of understanding and friendship", and it would be less than frank to deny that a certain amount of *schadenfreude* will be felt in this country. Israel spokesmen have declared time and again that Levantine arrogance and braggadocio of Shishakly, Naguib and their successors will be given only fresh impetus when faced by lack of firmness. Western statesmen have refused to learn the lesson whenever Israel was concerned, but they may be more willing to draw the necessary conclusions once they themselves have to eat the fruits of appeasement. On the very day that the Bat Galim case would have to be returned to the M.A.C. — a clear victory for the cause of appeasing the Egyptians — the Franco-Egyptian dispute reached its climax, and the French Premier threatened sanctions against the Cairo junta if open Egyptian intervention in Algeria continued. *Savut el Arab* has been calling the French "mad dogs", has invited the terrorists to murder as many Frenchmen as possible and has attacked M. Mendès-France in a way which, according to the French newspaper *Le Monde* would have done honor to *Der Stuermer*.

The Egyptian rulers (and the Iraqui, who have made great efforts of late to distract public opinion from domestic affairs) care about as much for the inhabitants of Algeria as they do about the Arabs of Palestine or their own people for that. But they cannot do without lightning conductors and scapegoats and will always need them — short of radical change at home.

The West will undoubtedly have to pay dearly for its wisdom. What with Byroade in Cairo and the general line of appeasement à l'outrance, they may soon have half a dozen Algerias on their hands. And they should not be surprised if the Shishaklys of Cairo claim Tours and Poitiers and Johannesburg.

Even the most progressive educators do not claim that the distribution of sweets cures brazen effrontery in the classroom. There are more efficient ways, and the teacher refusing to use them should not complain when some of the pupils become proper pests, getting ever more uppish.

Elias N. Koussa
Advocate
P.O. Box 14
Haifa, Israel.
15th November, 1954.

The Editor of the *Jerusalem Post*,
Jerusalem.

Dear Sir:

Although embellished with trilingual words, your editorial of today is objectionable in substance and form. It lacks propriety and objectivity, and is a notorious piece of rash thinking and irresponsible writing. It does not befit a respectable publication.

The phrase "Levantine Insolence" with which you crowned the disparaging tirade, is hardly consistent with Israel's desire, persistently professed, to cultivate friendly relations with its Arab neighbours. To describe as insolent, the action of the Arab League and the "Voice of the Arabs" in inciting the Arabs of Algeria to revolt does not only not serve any useful purpose, but will further embitter feelings and add tenseness to the already strained Arab-Israel relations. Nor will fishing in troubled waters bring Israel any nearer to its aim. And the vicious inferences which you wish to be drawn from the fact that the incitement to revolt is only directed to the Arabs of Algeria, and not to the inhabitants of Uzbekistan, are so preposterous that they seem to be symptoms of unbalanced judgement influenced by a strong sense of hate toward the Arabs. However, the argument is misconceived. The Uzbeks are not Arabs. They do not live in any part of the Arab world. Presumably, they enjoy complete autonomy within the Soviet Commonwealth. They are not sucked by greedy colonists nor looked upon as second or third class citizens. And above all, they do not raise the hue and cry for their liberation from the Russian yoke, if any. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Arab League and the "Voice of the Arabs" direct the call to revolt only to the Arabs of Algeria as well as to the inhabitants of Tunis and Morocco.

The Jewish irredentists called the British "dirty dogs", and spurred the Yishuv to revolt against the British usurpers and expel them from Eretz Israel. This method of disparagement and incitement was tacitly acclaimed by almost the entirety of the Jewish people, in and out of Palestine. Why then should a Jew be enraged when the same method is adopted by Gentiles struggling for their freedom, or for the independence of their brethren.

Your contention that "the Arab League representatives should be treated like Levantine adventurers, cowardly and servile when faced by firmness, impertinent and even insolent if they feel weakness and a willingness to compromise — and they have an excellent nose for that" simply discloses the extent of moral degradation to which human beings are apt to lower themselves by using unnecessarily and unavailingly poisonous expressions and vituperative language. For this reason, I disdainfully refrain from making any comment save that past events belie it. Arrest, incarceration, exile, imprisonment and execution, widely carried out in Iraq and Egypt by the British, and in Lebanon and Syria by the French, did not render

a single Arab leader coward and servile in the pursuit of his national aspirations.

The revolutions that occur, from time to time, in the Arab countries, are healthy signs of national consciousness and social awakening. They aim at the complete pulverization of the decrepit system of government and backward social structure prevailing in the Arab world. They require time to bear fruit. But they are, no doubt, clear indications of the firm volition of the Arab peoples to break with their past bondage and to build up a new society wherein the welfare of the whole community would be of paramount importance, and the interests of the governing and the governed are equally safe-guarded. In appraising these historical events, an impartial and fair observer would, undoubtedly, take into consideration the reactionary efforts of existing vested interests to retard the social developments and to frustrate the political changes. In their sober and wise attitude towards the Arabs, the United States and Great Britain correctly appreciate the concomitant difficulties and the surrounding obstacles. They see the reform in its true light, and need not the perverse counsel of a self-conceit.

The Arab leaders are not insolent. Far from poking their nose in the business of others, they are strenuously struggling to attain Arab rights, and continuously labouring to realize the national aspirations of the Arab peoples in Arab countries. Neither the former nor the latter aim constitutes "impertinence" or even "insolence" which are glaringly conspicuous in the attitude of a political novice and in the ever increasing criticizing behaviour of a pampered child toward his benevolent guardians. The Arab protest against the presentation of the credentials of the British and American Ambassadors in Jerusalem is understandable. The United States and Great Britain are the architects of the Tripartite Declaration and the pillars of the Western block. The Arabs consider them primarily responsible for the United Nations' Resolution of the 29th November, 1947, providing for the internationalization of Jerusalem. Having regard to the constant policy of identification with the West, it is only natural that they should protest against the ceremony being made in Jerusalem, and should ignore the presentation there of the credentials by the Soviet and Yugoslav diplomatic envoys.

The days of resort to forceful measures are gone. The British tried them in India, Iraq, Egypt and Sudan, and found out, to their great disappointment, that they did not pay. The French practised them in Indo-China, Lebanon, and Syria, and they had to depart with ignominy. Sooner or later, they will quit North Africa. The whip which you wish to be used against the Arab leaders is a very dangerous instrument. It has never subdued a living nation, but has, invariably, led to the destruction of its user.

I entertain no doubt that you will have the moral courage to publish this letter in the *Post*.

Yours faithfully,

E. N. Koussa.

2. THE MOVEMENT FOR COLONIAL FREEDOM AND THE SELF-DETERMINATION OF NATIONS

[On the occasion of the inaugural Conference of the Movement for Colonial Freedom* held in London on 11th April, 1954, we issued the following statement analysing and rejecting the proposed objects** of this Movement.]

FOR self-determination to be a reality and not a mere phrase to which everyone to-day (including leading politicians on both sides of the Iron Curtain who, in fact, oppress and subjugate nations) pays lip service, nothing more is required than that white rule in whatever form it is at present exercised, whether directly by colonial powers as in Kenya, Nigeria, etc., or indirectly as in the Gold Coast, or as "formally" independent of the metropolitan countries as in South Africa, immediately come to an end.

The work of the Movement for Colonial Freedom, if it wishes factually to prove to the colonial peoples that it is truly identified with them in their struggles for independence, must accordingly centre round a) the demand that the colonial powers at once withdraw all their troops and administrations from the colonies and b) simultaneously, the unconditional support with all means at its disposal of the struggles for independence in the colonies howsoever they are waged whether violent or not.

What form of government there shall be in the colonies once they become independent and are colonies no longer, what social and economic organisation, is not to be determined in advance by any one (least of all by a Movement for Colonial Freedom), but is to be left to the peoples concerned to decide upon freely for themselves with reference to their own needs alone.

The colonial peoples within the present international framework in which everything is in the last analysis determined by the demands of armaments production and power politics (for which their own colonial status is indispensable), have no need at all for economic "aid" and technical assistance no matter in what form it is given. Under the given conditions briefly indicated such "aid" can serve only the ends of the Imperial Powers. For the colonial people it can mean only the further plunder and destruction of their country together with intensified exploitation on the basis of

* During the course of the Conference, the Congress changed its name to the "Movement for Colonial Freedom". Our statement, originally entitled "The Congress for Colonial Freedom and the Self-Determination of Nations", has been altered for publication accordingly.

** The proposed objects read: "That this Conference resolves to establish the Congress for Colonial Freedom to support: (a) The rights of Colonial peoples to independence (self-government and self-determination) and of all peoples to freedom from external economic or military domination; (b) The application throughout the world of the principle of 'fair shares for all' by extending to under-developed territories economic aid free from exploitation or external ownership; (c) The application of the Four Freedoms and the Declaration of Human Rights to all peoples, including Freedom from Contempt by the abolition of the Colour Bar; (d) Technical assistance to [sic] educational and economic advance in the under-developed territories, particularly to the Trade Union and Co-operative Movements; (e) The substitution of Internationalism for Imperialism in all economic and political relations, including action through the United Nations."

slave labour on the Russian model. The struggle of the colonial peoples, on the contrary, aims in the first instance at being free to use their own wealth, in particular the land, as they see fit. Other matters such as reciprocal trade with Europe and America need not be discussed now when the main task is to achieve the precondition for *all* progressive development genuinely in the interests of the colonial peoples, viz. independence of white rule.

Nor have the colonial peoples any wish to receive "fair shares" of what at present the Imperial Powers have to "offer" them, which includes a "share" only in their own resources. They are sick to death of such "offerings" and merely wish to be masters in their own homes, when it will be up to them to decide whether they are to share their wealth at all.

Again, instead of imperialism (of which the United Nations is simply an expression), the colonial peoples desire not internationalism (which in the present economic-political framework must be imperialism by another name as e.g. United Nations "Trusteeship") but only *national freedom*.

Clearly then, points b) to e) of the objects as proposed for the consideration of the Movement are in direct contradiction to, and in fact nullify, the stated aim of support for "the rights of Colonial peoples to independence (self government and self determination) and of all peoples to freedom from external economic or military domination". And this point itself falls far short of what is required by failing to make unequivocally clear the Movement's unconditional support of all struggles for independence whether violent or not. The kind of struggle, e.g. whether it is a fight for survival as the Mau Mau in Kenya, or at any specific point takes the form of less violent or non-violent non-collaboration, depends largely on the conditions imposed by white rule. In principle the whole matter could be immediately and entirely peacefully settled simply by the voluntary abdication and ending of white rule by the ruling minorities at home and in colonial countries. If, however, the white minorities (and this in fact applies also to the whole of the white population in the territories concerned) resist the *rightful* majority rights of the colonial peoples and *defend* their obsolescent and for the majority absolutely ruinous economic and political privileges in the most barbarous fashion *against* the majority, then the consequences whatever they may be are entirely their own fault; and the colonial peoples are *democratically* justified and must be supported and helped in the use of all means required by the situation to achieve their independence.

In the light of this it is proposed that the objects of the Movement be re-drafted as follows: —

1. This Movement acknowledges the right of all peoples to self-determination and condemns outright the imposition of colonial rule in any form whatsoever.
2. The Movement states that complete independence from the Imperial Powers is the precondition for any developments really in the interests of the colonial peoples, and recognizes that the struggle for national freedom is at the same time a decisive aspect of the desired dissolution of imperialism in all its forms.
3. Accordingly this Movement demands and shall continue to demand that the Imperial Powers immediately and unconditionally grant the

colonial peoples complete independence, and at once withdrew their whole administrations and troops from the colonies.

4. Should the Imperial Powers refuse to do so, this Movement commits itself unequivocally to support the struggles of the colonial peoples in whatever form they take whether violent or not for complete independence with all the means in its power.

Agreement having been reached on these proposals, the Movement should at once proceed to discuss concretely what help can be given in the actual struggles now proceeding in Kenya, Morocco, Malaya, British Guiana, Uganda, and elsewhere.

10th April, 1954.

REPORT ON THE CONFERENCE

One of our friends writes:

YOU will be pleased to know definitely that our troubles are all over, at least as far as the colonies are concerned. A couple of Sundays ago, the Movement for Colonial Freedom was launched in London, and some of us were privileged to be present. That, I think, fairly accurately sums up the atmosphere dispensed from on high upon the place beneath. But I am pleased to say, the Movement for a Democracy of Content, as Wedgwood Benn so amiably insisted, managed quite definitely to convey the impression that it was thoroughly *discontented*, some of which discontent it managed in some small degree to transfer to the platform, much to everybody's irritation, except, of course, our own.

I arrived at the Waldorf Hotel where the inaugural conference was held at about 9.45 a.m. on Sunday the 11th [of April], to find that some of our friends had done a really solid job of distributing the statement that we had prepared by placing one copy on every chair in the place. We could not have made a better start. It just so happened that our effort was headed *The Congress for Colonial Freedom and the Self-Determination of Nations*, while the official screeds which were handed out were also headed *The Congress for Colonial Freedom*; and at first glance it looked as though they all belonged together. This set up an agitation of no mean order, and our first rap on the knuckles came from Emrys Thomas (Remember The Good Old Days In The I.L.P.!), who had carved a niche for himself as chairman of what by a happy exercise of literary ingenuity was felicitously styled "The Affairs Arrangements Committee". This worthy sidled towards us and complained that we should have asked permission to behave in such an outrageous fashion, and that we had created a very bad impression, to which we replied that this was no doubt better than no impression at all. After a few more disconsolate clucks, he beetled off again.

The conference was opened a few minutes later by the Daddy of the Colonies, Fenner Brockway himself, in person, who got up, and after surveying his consortium much in the spirit of Arthur surveying the Knights of the Round Table (with Wedgwood Benn — pure-in-heart — as Lancelot, Jenny Lee, who appeared in the afternoon, as Guinevere, and

Ted Bedford as the Round Table), found fit to announce before any other business that delegates should not be deceived by a document which had been placed on their seats, which was not an official document, but had been issued, etc., etc. (plug No. 1). He then announced that the chairman of the Affairs Arrangements Committee had an announcement to make, and Emma got up to announce in the most official of all possible voices that the A.A.C. had decided that since the document in question (plug No. 2) disagreed completely with the objects of the Congress as stated in the agenda, the proposed amendments to the objects could not be considered as amendments, but as a new set of objects, and would therefore not be put to the vote; but the authors (ourselves) would be allowed to talk to their statement (far more interesting than talking to Emrys Thomas) and if the delegates agreed with the authors they would then vote against the objects as stated on the agenda. He then yelled: Is that agreed? and took a vote on the matter before any of us had really twigged what was happening, and that was that.

Having thus extracted this somewhat nasty thorn from their sides, Fenner felt himself free to do his stuff, and off he went, followed soon after by Wedgwood Benn, M.P.

In general we were informed that we were about to take a historic step the like of which had not been seen since Wilberforce initiated his campaign against the slave trade, together with other like flattering and encouraging exhortations. At one point Wedgwood Benn admitted that he had been a good socialist for more than twenty years, but that it was only a few years back when he was in Southern Rhodesia that he had realized that the colonies were the concern of good socialists. What it was before that concerned good socialists we were left to imagine. Harry Weaver of the Building Workers' Union also gave out with a lot of stuff, especially about conscription and the terrible effect that the brutality which conscripts were forced to carry out in "our name" must have on the morale of the younger generation before they were subject, if you please, to the civilizing and humanizing influence of (guess what!) — the Trade Union Movement! The answer: — To abolish conscription? No sir, but — wait for it — that all Trade Union branches should appoint a forces secretary and ensure that Trade Union literature be distributed amongst the troops. Amen.

After these introductory remarks, came what, for want of a better word, I suppose I must call "discussion". And here the A.A.C. again came into its own. Speeches were strictly limited to five minutes, and like the man he is, Emma John Thomas took upon his already heavily weighted shoulders the additional onerous responsibility of sounding a bell on the fourth minute of each speech to warn the speaker and, to use Fenner Brockway's own words, to sound the buzzer loud and long on the stroke of the fifth minute of a speech no matter what the speaker happened to be saying or what point he had reached in his argument. Having thus animated the conference with the true and proper spirit of fair shares for all, the "discussion" was launched; and, transparently to get rid of us as soon as possible, we were called upon to speak first. Pierre (Watter) went up and spoke very well indeed, summarizing our statement and putting forward our position

clearly and logically. After all the demagogery we had been subjected to, it was a pleasure to listen to him. We were not given a chance to second our motion (although others were later given a chance to second theirs), but immediately Fenner called upon somebody to oppose it. An Indian named Pande got up and belted into us, accusing us of wanting to create anarchy, of abusing decency and decorum, of being impractical idealists whereas the objects as stated were immediate and practical (you bet!), and therefore *opposed* (sic!) our proposed objects and called upon the Congress to *reject* them. He need not have got so excited. They were on his side from the start, and I only wish I could remember even a quarter of the political gems which were bandied back and forth. At one point a trade unionist was giving out with some heavy stuff that what was wanted in Guiana was a war on poverty, ignorance, disease, squalor, malnutrition, etc., to which we added in a loud voice, — and the British! A brisk character in a Vandyke beard in front of us kept popping up like a jack-in-the-box: — “On a point of order Mr. Chairman, would not the mover of the amendment be satisfied if in the fourth line of the second paragraph on the third page, the word ‘the’ was changed to the word ‘any.’” One smiling African welcomed the Congress in the name of humanity, goodness, universal kindness and brotherly love, and assured us that we had the backing of the masses of Liverpool!

In fact there was only one amendment of any real content proposed, and that was to add, after the first object (that all colonies had the right to self-determination): “With special emphasis on the need for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from the colonies”. The cat was among the pigeons again. This was immediately linked by the platform with our statement, to such an extent that the proposers (Stalinists I should imagine — one of them stated he would listen to no slander about Russia!), had rather violently to disassociate themselves from us. At this stage the platform became painfully aware that they would have themselves to deal with this rather troublesome thing which was rearing its ugly head with too much insistence for comfort, and the Benn himself rose to reply. There was at first a little bright repartee concerning the pronunciation of the word “content”, and after having been corrected, he completely floored us by uttering his first, his one and his only honest statement of the day as follows: — “Fair enough! I’ll get the pronunciation right even if I don’t understand the arguments!” — an ideal basis on which he proceeded to “argue”. The “arguments” trotted out by rote were: By withdrawing our (sic!) troops, we would be playing into the hands of Malan, especially in the protectorates (as far as I know there are no troops in the protectorate), and the settlers who would be the first people to cheer if the troops were withdrawn and with them the protection they afforded the Africans against the settlers’ excesses; the presence of troops was in itself neither here nor there; what was decisive was the political control exercised over the troops, and thus what was needed was a change of Government (from Tory to Labour) in Britain itself; were we to sacrifice the contribution (sic!) we had to make towards the development of the colonies (Pierre’s point about armament production was of course completely ignored) based on 200 years of peaceful (sic!) development and support indiscriminately the extremities

of Mau-Mau (we were, of course, accused of advocating violence and terrorism!), etc., etc., *ad nauseam*. Well! Some movements took fifty years to discredit themselves, some took ten years, some even six months; but I am prepared to bet the Movement for Colonial Freedom (the name was changed from Congress to Movement as a result of an amendment from the floor, a circumstance which drew a loud and heart-rending complaint from the A.A.C. to the effect that they would have to reprint all their literature!) broke all previous records. They took exactly fifteen minutes. It was not even necessary to have a count of votes on the matter. The show of cards was sufficient. The amendment was rejected, and the Movement for Colonial Freedom had committed itself to maintaining foreign (British) troops in the colonies!

When the time came for the vote on the objects of the Movement we were treated to one of those rare spectacles, a charming pantomimic entertainment, which so gladden the hearts of Fenner's hosts of admirers. On the call for the vote in favour a forest of hands went up. But when he called for the vote against, Brockway rose and announced to the assembly that he thought that even he (member of parliament as he was) was capable of counting the votes against. And, pointing to each one of us in turn, he proclaimed in the voice of a clergyman reading the lesson for the day: — One . . . Two . . . Three . . . right up to Seven. It appeared, however, that Public School Education (at least one presumes it must be education) was not equal to the task: the intellectual effort required to count up to nine was beyond the capacity of our Member of Parliament, since he completely neglected two dissentients at the back who protested loudly at this discrimination. We never found out who they were.

Having thus successfully disposed of the politics, the Movement for Colonial Freedom could now really get cracking, and Fenner called on Ted Bedford to move the adoption of the interim constitution, and what a motion ensued, the gist of which may be summed up as follows: That this constitution was without doubt the most democratic constitution which it was possible to devise, and he earnestly hoped that the delegates would pass it without much discussion in the realization that it was after all only an interim constitution until an interim committee was democratically elected which would finalize its form in the spirit in which it was meant, so that he, Ted Bedford, could sit down to his lunch at 12.30 pronto in order to stimulate, no doubt, further motions.

In the ensuing discussion, apart from a good deal of haggling about money and the costs of affiliation to the Movement, two points were noteworthy.

The first was the request to remove the word "democratic" from the designation of National Liberatory Movements with which the Movement for Colonial Freedom (my typewriter buckles with anger every time I type this name!) would be prepared to co-operate, since it enabled the Central Committee to set themselves up in the fashion of McCarthy to pass judgement on which movements were or were not democratic; whereas in fact all National Liberatory Movements were by their very nature democratic (this came from the delegate from the Uganda National Congress). This caused a further motion from Ted Bedford that it would be extremely

undemocratic to delete the word democratic. The amendment was naturally rejected.

The second was from a delegate from the Muslim Brotherhood who said he was extremely perturbed at the way in which the Movement appeared to be falling under the domination of the Trade Unions, and he wanted an assurance that this was not the case, since from his own personal experience in the Somali Seamen's Union, the Trade Unions actively propagated and supported the colour bar. Needless to say the required assurance was not forthcoming. He was answered by a member of the Firemen's Union who asserted that in his opinion his Mohammedan (sic!) friend was right off the track, and that nothing better could happen than that the Movement should come under the domination of the Trade Unions; and to press home his point he reminded us that one union had donated £50 to the Movement to see them on their way.

The final touch before lunch came from the vast storehouse of political profundity which seems to constitute Ted Bedford's own peculiar genius, who assured the delegate that (I record this for the benefit of posterity): — "This movement is dominated by nothing but Democracy"!!!

. . . After lunch we returned to the fray. And now it was demonstrated to us that we are truly innocents when it comes to the really important business of politics — and I do mean *business*. Here I must applaud unreservedly the performance of young Wedgwood Benn Gielgud, and can only predict a great future for this shining new personality who has arisen to grace our stage. His inspirations were moving in the extreme — not the least amongst which was the daring combination of his mathematical proclivities with his charitable impulses. These he introduced by drawing the attention of his spellbound audience to the direct connection between their responsibilities and the activities of that great and universal provider, Her Majesty's Government. This august body we were informed was spending 1 per cent of its annual income on colonial development; and if we wished to demonstrate our *bona fides*, the very least we could do was to contribute the same. For the benefit of us lesser mortals who are forced to struggle against the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune without the benefits of a superior education, he had engaged the services of a leading mathematician from the Ministry of Statistics, and proudly announced the results of his investigations. If there was one among us who earned £1,000 a year, the least he could do in order to prove that he had the interests of the colonial peoples as much at heart as the beneficent government was like them to contribute at least 1 per cent of his income, namely £10. Those who earned £15 a week, should contribute £7-10, those who earned £10, so much, £9, so much and so on. After each delineation of income commitment he paused decently to enable those so specified to make their contribution further sparing no effort to save those who happened to be temporarily embarrassed any feelings of discomfort on that account, by a continual assurance that he would accept cheques, I.O.U.'s, letters of credit, etc. He further insisted with that impeccable logic for which his name is becoming a byword, that these commitments devolved especially upon those whose no doubt well-intentioned efforts to amend the objects of the movement had been democratically defeated. And here he did us the

honour of alluding directly to us in the following immensely moving, albeit simple, words: — "What about you people who were beaten on the foreign troops issue? Surely you must give even more!" — The Muslim who protested about the Trade Unions was favoured with a similar inspired entreaty.

Having thus disposed of the larger sums, he went on to deal with the smaller ones in the same brilliant vein. With regard to silver he admitted he had realized that we were not all so fortunate as to be possessed of private means of transport, and would therefore have to retain in our pockets certain monies to compensate the public transport authorities for their trouble on our behalf. He consequently made the consumingly modest demand that we should contribute merely half the silver we had on us. And as for copper, after all, it was Sunday, there were no evening papers, and he therefore wanted all the copper in the house. Eminently reasonable, I am sure.

The appeal was supported from the platform by one prime, first class, unadulterated specimen of pure quislingism called, in this instance, Joseph Murumbi — a college boy. To hear this self-styled Secretary of the Kenya African Union telling us in order to collect money for Brockway and his gang that this was the only way in which we could help the Africans, prove our sincerity, and show that we were not a bunch of talkers (and mouthing the miseries of the Kikuyu, the land question in Kenya, etc., in support of his point) was enough to make any decent person spew.

In spite of everything I have said about the performance to date, there is no doubt who actually topped the bill. And that was brisk, bustling, bonny Jennie Lee, the will o' the wisp from the wild Scots hill, who did her stuff in the afternoon, immediately following the auction sale. She started off in the true spirit of the President of the Mutual Admiration Society by paying generous tribute to the spirit of sacrifice, sincerity, nobility, generosity and untiring devotion to the cause of Fenner Brockway, Leslie Hale, Wedgwood Benn, *her* Aneurin [Bevan], Sir Leslie Plummer, old Uncle Tom Cobley and all, provided only that they were members of the Labour Party.

At one point she was cataloguing the iniquities of the imperialists in the colonies with great gusto, and to our intense surprise, started to reel off some good stuff about the meaning of independence, to such an extent that she was leading to the point where there could be only one *logical* conclusion to her remarks, and that was of course the demand for the immediate withdrawal of all troops. We began getting excited, thinking in our *naïveté*, My God, she wasn't here this morning, she doesn't know what happened and she is really going to drop one large-sized brick! Alas, poor innocents! What was the conclusion to which this tirade sped with the inexorability of a law of nature? It was nothing but this, and may I be hanged for a shotten herring or a bull's pizzle if I tell thee false: — That China should be admitted to the United Nations!!!

After introducing the policy statement, she sat down amidst a great ovation, and was followed by Sir Leslie Plummer, with all taps open. He also did his stuff as Vice President of the Mutual Admiration Society by bringing our Jennie into the picture, followed by the usual load of bull

about how the Labour Party had intransigently opposed Central African Federation and how the Tories by forcing Federation had prepared the ground for handing the protectorates over to Malan, etc. Thereafter we were once again permitted by the generous platform to "discuss", and the discussion which followed was pretty much on the same idiotic level as its counterpart in the morning, with one or two interesting exceptions.

Mary Klopper moved an addition to the policy statement about Kenya as follows: — a) that the new constitution be rejected and a common voter's roll be instituted; b) that an amnesty be granted to all prisoners convicted of crimes which were not punishable offences before the declaration of the emergency; and c) that the White Highlands be made available for Africans. This of course set everybody purring at one another like a lot of self-righteous and contented pussy cats, preening themselves on their virtue and enjoying their moral indignation like billy-ho, to such an extent that we decided it was about time to attempt to upset the apple cart once more. So Stanley Trevor waved his card and was invited up to the platform. (The announcement of his name and the Movement for a Democracy of Content drew an "Oh my God" from Brockway.) He said briefly that while no one could doubt that the question of land was of paramount importance in Kenya, this was not strictly their business, and that delegates should direct their thoughts, discussion and actions, to what it was that was preventing such very necessary reforms, namely, quite definitely, the presence of foreign troops (a long suffering sigh from Brockway). He pointed out that Jennie Lee had stated that independence for the colonies meant, precisely, independence, and did not include contributions from Europeans in the form of constitutions, voters' rolls, or dictation as to the form of government to be set up, but only *independence*; and that presence of foreign troops in itself constituted the fundamental travesty and violation of the democratic rights of the colonial peoples. So long as this movement was committed, as it had been in the morning, to maintaining the presence of foreign troops in the colonies, it had destroyed its *bona fides*, and would be regarded by the colonial peoples as just another white conference in the interests of white rule. He urged the delegates to take immediate steps to prevent this grievous betrayal.

Trevor stepped down amidst some vociferous clapping from a minute section of the audience, and on his way back was stopped by an African (one of the twelve present out of 300 delegates) who congratulated him and thanked him for making what he considered to be the all-important point, and asked to meet us afterwards for some discussion.

Immediately after this this African was called up onto the platform and we saw him in earnest consultation with Brockway. He did not speak however and we wondered what it was all about. (He told us afterwards that Brockway had asked him to get up and say something, but that he had refused point blank — he did not mention what it was Brockway had asked him to say — called Brockway an opportunist to his face, and stalked off the platform.)

At one point an emergency resolution on Indo-China was presented to the platform, and in announcing it, Brockway indicated that it was not strictly within the province of the policy statement which they were dis-

cussing, but that if there were time at the end it would be discussed. In any case it would be taken up by the Central Council.

This by the way was their favourite trick. Every amendment which contained anything which could possibly be interpreted as political was dismissed with the assurance that it would be "taken up" by the Central Council. In what way it would be "taken up" was never specified but the delegates were urged to take the policy statement in the spirit in which it was meant as a basis for further action, and to trust (sic!) the Central Council to incorporate the progressive policies of the delegates in any further statement or action it might undertake.

In spite of Brockway's assurances, however, that the Indo-China business would be taken up by the Central Council, some inquisitive busybody amongst us had the temerity to ask whether he would read the resolution so that we could know what it said; at which he delivered himself of the following in a voice of tired resignation: — *"Oh yes! I suppose they might as well hear it!"*

Interesting points in the discussion were a resolution calling upon the movement to institute a boycott of the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Entente Cordiale, in view of the barbarous fascist methods of the French in North Africa, and the existence of concentration camps "worse than under the Nazis" in the Sahara Desert (this the delegate was assured would be taken up by the Central Council and no vote was called for). An amendment was moved, once again by the delegate from the Uganda National Congress, objecting to the emphasis on the Trade Unions in the policy statement, and urging that the reference to the Trade Unions be eliminated and that the appeal be addressed for support for the colonial struggle to the British people as a whole. When they were assured that this would be taken up by the Central Council, they would have none of it, and stuck to their guns even to the point of rejecting Brockway's suggestion that from a show of hands alone it was obvious that their amendment was defeated, and demanded a count of hands. Needless to say they were in fact defeated.

At one point Mrs. Laski got up on to the platform and belted into the Labour Party for having proscribed the Kenya Committee. She said that she had only discovered this because certain Labour M.P.s had refused to address them. She felt that it could only be because the secretary happened to be Communist, and thought that the whole business was disgusting, and that this McCarthyism should be exposed and routed out of the Labour Party. It was nice to see Brockway squirm (especially after the build up he had given Frieda Laski when he introduced her). He hummed and ha-ad a bit until a happy thought struck him and he announced that the actions of the Labour Party were really outside the province of the Movement for Colonial Freedom (after the Labour Party propaganda we had been subjected to, this was rich!); but he assured Mrs. Laski that — wait for it! — this too would be "taken up" by the Central Council.

A really marvellous incident occurred during the handing out of the ballot papers for the ELECTION of the CENTRAL COUNCIL, a matter which was treated with all the GRAVITY that so SERIOUS an occasion deserved, and once again presented Emma, dressed in a little brief authority, with an

opportunity to display his talents, especially for interrupting discussion. The African who was so rudely interrupted however was quite unabashed and during the whole ceremony waited patiently with an air of tolerant amusement for these pretty pranks and the quaint ways of the white folk, accompanied by smiles so overflowing with natural bonhomie and charm that he was like a breath of fresh air in a London fog.

When things had settled down a bit he explained to us that we must understand that Africans attending white peoples' congresses with which they were totally unfamiliar laboured under many difficulties. All they could do was to sit back and listen and in their own dreamy way try to follow as much of what was going on as they possibly could. For this reason he asked the Chairman to forgive him if he reverted to something which had already been discussed in the morning, since he somehow realized he was doing something very naughty in bringing back into the afternoon's session something which had already been disposed of in the morning. He then explained that he and his friends had discussed the matter over lunch, trying to collect their somewhat confused and bewildered impressions, and as a result he had been entrusted with a mission to say something to the delegates about the constitution. . . . All this was accompanied by this really wonderful smile, and he had by now taken well over his allotted five minutes. By this time the platform was really squirming since it was obvious that the conference loved him. Brockway got up and said, obviously trying to be friendly, but with as much authority as he dared: — "Brother you will really have to make this point broad if you are going to be in order" — and the African assured him that he would make the point as broadly as he possibly could "*in order to bring it down within these limits*". This last remark completely broke the resistance of the platform and he had to be allowed to be "out of order". A victory indeed!

He proceeded to say that he and his friends had discussed the question of membership of the Central Council, and according to the constitution — here I must explain that when this chap came onto the platform he had in his hand all the bumf which had been given the delegates on their arrival; and at this point he attempted to refer to the clause in question in the constitution. Well! What a performance! He shuffled these papers about, looked at them from this way and that, studied them, turned them inside out and upside down, and at one point dropped about four of them onto the floor. There was however no sort of embarrassment or apology accompanying all this. Finally, once again flashing at one and all his overwhelming smile, he simply turned round to Brockway, handed him the lot and asked him to find the offending clause, and with this gesture the onus was quite clearly passed onto those who had found it necessary to inflict such tortures on decent folk by cluttering up their lives with stupid documents which were obviously only fit for one purpose. The audience responded to a man, and the victory over the platform was turned into a rout.

When the point was finally made, it was a good one, and was in fact the political counterpart of his behaviour on the platform. He pointed out that the conditions for membership of and affiliation to the Central Council

cussing, but that if there were time at the end it would be discussed. In any case it would be taken up by the Central Council.

This by the way was their favourite trick. Every amendment which contained anything which could possibly be interpreted as political was dismissed with the assurance that it would be "taken up" by the Central Council. In what way it would be "taken up" was never specified but the delegates were urged to take the policy statement in the spirit in which it was meant as a basis for further action, and to trust (sic!) the Central Council to incorporate the progressive policies of the delegates in any further statement or action it might undertake.

In spite of Brockway's assurances, however, that the Indo-China business would be taken up by the Central Council, some inquisitive busybody amongst us had the temerity to ask whether he would read the resolution so that we could know what it said; at which he delivered himself of the following in a voice of tired resignation: — *"Oh yes! I suppose they might as well hear it!"*

Interesting points in the discussion were a resolution calling upon the movement to institute a boycott of the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Entente Cordiale, in view of the barbarous fascist methods of the French in North Africa, and the existence of concentration camps "worse than under the Nazis" in the Sahara Desert (this the delegate was assured would be taken up by the Central Council and no vote was called for). An amendment was moved, once again by the delegate from the Uganda National Congress, objecting to the emphasis on the Trade Unions in the policy statement, and urging that the reference to the Trade Unions be eliminated and that the appeal be addressed for support for the colonial struggle to the British people as a whole. When they were assured that this would be taken up by the Central Council, they would have none of it, and stuck to their guns even to the point of rejecting Brockway's suggestion that from a show of hands alone it was obvious that their amendment was defeated, and demanded a count of hands. Needless to say they were in fact defeated.

At one point Mrs. Laski got up on to the platform and belted into the Labour Party for having proscribed the Kenya Committee. She said that she had only discovered this because certain Labour M.P.s had refused to address them. She felt that it could only be because the secretary happened to be Communist, and thought that the whole business was disgusting, and that this McCarthyism should be exposed and routed out of the Labour Party. It was nice to see Brockway squirm (especially after the build up he had given Frieda Laski when he introduced her). He hummed and ha-ad a bit until a happy thought struck him and he announced that the actions of the Labour Party were really outside the province of the Movement for Colonial Freedom (after the Labour Party propaganda we had been subjected to, this was rich!); but he assured Mrs. Laski that — wait for it! — this too would be "taken up" by the Central Council.

A really marvellous incident occurred during the handing out of the ballot papers for the ELECTION of the CENTRAL COUNCIL, a matter which was treated with all the GRAVITY that so SERIOUS an occasion deserved, and once again presented Emma, dressed in a little brief authority, with an

opportunity to display his talents, especially for interrupting discussion. The African who was so rudely interrupted however was quite unabashed and during the whole ceremony waited patiently with an air of tolerant amusement for these pretty pranks and the quaint ways of the white folk, accompanied by smiles so overflowing with natural bonhomie and charm that he was like a breath of fresh air in a London fog.

When things had settled down a bit he explained to us that we must understand that Africans attending white peoples' congresses with which they were totally unfamiliar laboured under many difficulties. All they could do was to sit back and listen and in their own dreamy way try to follow as much of what was going on as they possibly could. For this reason he asked the Chairman to forgive him if he reverted to something which had already been discussed in the morning, since he somehow realized he was doing something very naughty in bringing back into the afternoon's session something which had already been disposed of in the morning. He then explained that he and his friends had discussed the matter over lunch, trying to collect their somewhat confused and bewildered impressions, and as a result he had been entrusted with a mission to say something to the delegates about the constitution. . . . All this was accompanied by this really wonderful smile, and he had by now taken well over his allotted five minutes. By this time the platform was really squirming since it was obvious that the conference loved him. Brockway got up and said, obviously trying to be friendly, but with as much authority as he dared: — "Brother you will really have to make this point broad if you are going to be in order" — and the African assured him that he would make the point as broadly as he possibly could "*in order to bring it down within these limits*". This last remark completely broke the resistance of the platform and he had to be allowed to be "out of order". A victory indeed!

He proceeded to say that he and his friends had discussed the question of membership of the Central Council, and according to the constitution — here I must explain that when this chap came onto the platform he had in his hand all the bumf which had been given the delegates on their arrival; and at this point he attempted to refer to the clause in question in the constitution. Well! What a performance! He shuffled these papers about, looked at them from this way and that, studied them, turned them inside out and upside down, and at one point dropped about four of them onto the floor. There was however no sort of embarrassment or apology accompanying all this. Finally, once again flashing at one and all his overwhelming smile, he simply turned round to Brockway, handed him the lot and asked him to find the offending clause, and with this gesture the onus was quite clearly passed onto those who had found it necessary to inflict such tortures on decent folk by cluttering up their lives with stupid documents which were obviously only fit for one purpose. The audience responded to a man, and the victory over the platform was turned into a rout.

When the point was finally made, it was a good one, and was in fact the political counterpart of his behaviour on the platform. He pointed out that the conditions for membership of and affiliation to the Central Council

simply excluded Africans, since the term "National Organizations" referred to organizations inside England, not Africa. He and his friends thought that the basis for membership of and election to the Central Council ought to be widened considerably to include Africans and African organizations. This was in fact something in the nature of a bombshell; but the imperturbable Brockway took it all in his stride, and assured the African that it was certainly not the intention of the drafters of the constitution to exclude Africans from the Central Council; and he could be sure that the Central Council would take the matter up.

Shortly after this the resolution on Indo-China was moved. And a rotten weak-kneed thing it was, calling merely for an immediate cease-fire in Indo-China and for resistance against any attempt to extend the war. . . .

Thereafter Brockway announced that while we were waiting for the results of the election we might relax, have a smoke and talk to our neighbours. In other words, "politics" was over for the day and the pupils took the master at his word, in spite of the fact that a Nigerian had just asked permission to address the audience. They took no notice of him whatsoever, and he attempted to talk against the combined babbling of the whole crew. It was obvious that he could hardly hear himself speaking; and while he started off being very friendly, he justifiably got more and more furious, and at the end simply stated that the Africans were sick and tired of talk, talk, talk by the white people, and had had enough of it. And that this movement would be judged not by its words but by its actions. It was obvious that he had made the necessary judgment.

We were also disgusted and decided that it was time to leave. Brockway once more announced that the assembly had his permission to relax. And as we left the hall we heard him crowning his magnificent performance and the stirring events of the day by calling upon the Africans present to give us an African song.

For some inexplicable reason, however, it appeared that the Africans present were in no mood for singing. . . .

Peter Hanwell.

Verb. Sap.

. . . A Torquay hypnotist, Mr. H. Blyth, has suggested in a telegram to the Trades Union Congress that he should hypnotise Mr. Baty, leaders of the National Union of Railwaymen, and members of the Transport Commission. "If necessary," he said, "I could hypnotise both parties over the telephone but personal contact would be more effective." Mr. Blyth said his offer was serious, and that he was sure he could stop the strike "before the country faces ruin and seaside resorts suffer disastrous losses". (*Manchester Guardian*, 1st June, 1955.)

Index to CONTEMPORARY ISSUES, Volume 5

Subject	Author	No.	Page
America:			
America on the Road of Hitler and Stalin	M & D	18	136
Atomic Policy and the Rosenberg Case — One Year Later	John Clarkson	19	142
Notes on the Firing of Oppenheimer	P. S. MacDougal	20	254
On the Politics and Economics of Atomic Development in the U.S.A.	John Clarkson	20	259
The Book Business in America	Alan Dutscher	17	38
The Case of Burton Rosen	M & D	19	203
The Rosenberg Case. Some Observations	Irwin Edelman	20	318
Vignettes of American Liberty (ii) The Right to Live	Martin Morris	18	113
Year One of the Eisenhower Crusade	Robert Keller	18	86
Berlin, 17th June . . .	F. Lohenbill	18	115
Britain:			
The British Railway (Western Region) Strike — May, 1954	N. Parker	19	200
The Campaign Against Conscription in Britain	—	17	60
The Hydrogen Bomb:			
Experiment in Annihilation	Jules Laurens	20	214
How to Stop the Bomb: Two Views	W. J. Hall, M.A., & Paul Ecker	20	310
Letter	Mrs. Debee S. Brennan	20	326
Murder Not Suicide. An Open Letter to Lord Cherwell	Andrew Maxwell	20	322
Note on the Campaign Against the Hydrogen Bomb	—	20	325
Israel, Letter	E. N. Koussa	19	209
Kenya under the Iron Heel	A. E. Ross	17	2
Postscript to Genocide	Ralph Herman	17	58
Puerto Rico:			
How Free is Puerto Rico?	Ralph T. Templin	19	212
Pedro Albizu-Campos. A Note to our Readers	—	17	35
The Case of Puerto Rico	—	18	66
South Africa:			
We Will Not Move	M & D	17	61
do.	E. V. Swart	19	204
The Peace Campaign	R. N. Petrov	18	125
The Ring of the Nibelung	Wilhelm Lunen	19	156
The Society for Social Responsibility in Science			
Growing — Not Dying			
(i) Rejoinder to P.M.	Victor Paschakis	18	129
(ii) Reply	P.M.	18	131



Index to CONTEMPORARY ISSUES, Volume 6

Subject	Author	No.	Page
Chemicals in Food:			
A Follow up on the Problem of Chemicals in Food	L. Herber	21	51
Correspondence	—	21	74
Comments			
Critical Revue on Doctor Faustus — Prologue in the Heaven of Art	Ernst Zander	24	238
Guiana: Britain Drops the Mask	Erik Erikson	24	265
Germany:			
The Campaign against Remilitarization in Germany	Ernst Zander	23	170
Guiana: Britain Drops the Mask	Paul Ecker	21	39
The Hydrogen Bomb:			
A Letter to a Scientist	Albert Schweizer	22	90
Atomic Power Stations	Frederick Soddy	23	220
Correspondence	Frederick Soddy & C. Deglio	23	221
Ideologies and Annihilation	Jules Laurens	22	91
On the Cumulative Effects Produced by Thermonuclear Explosions on the Surface of the Globe	Charles-Noël Martin	23	218
Reactions to 'Stop the Bomb'	—	22	146
The Bomb and the Weather	Karl Berninger	22	114
The Hydrogen Bomb and British Politics — An Interim Report	Peter Hanwell	24	245
The Pioneers of Radioactivity	Frederick Soddy	23	221
Israel:			
The Fate of the Palestine Arabs	Marian A. Pearl	21	2
Levantine Insolence	—	24	291
Reply	E. N. Koussa	24	293
Is the Fluorine Found in Some Waters Really "Natural" and "Organic"?	Leo Spire, M.D., Ph.D. (Med.)	23	215
The Midolinian Revolution, or The Vision of Uncle Sam	Thomas Titmus	21	57
The Movement for Colonial Freedom and the Self-Determination of Nations	M & D	24	295
Report on the Conference of the Movement	Peter Hanwell	24	297
The Japanese Expropriations	Annette Brenner & S. H. Barton	23	222
The Responsibility of Free Men	H. D. Kirk	22	162
The Uses of Civil Defense	Robert Ilson & William J. Valley	24	288
Togoland: Correspondence	D. P. & Paul Ecker	23	230
U.S. Immigration Authorities vs. A Kenya Student	M & D	21	66

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES can be obtained from:

Contemporary Press, 26 Heber Road, London, N.W.2
John & Edward Bumpus Ltd., 477 Oxford Street, London, W.1
Wm. Dawson & Sons Ltd., Cannon House, Macklin Street, London, W.C.2
B. F. Stevens & Brown Ltd., 28-30 Little Russell Street, London, W.C.1
Edw. G. Allen & Son, 10-12-14 Grapen Street, Shaftesbury Avenue, London, W.C.2
Gordon & Gotch Ltd., 75 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4
Humanities Books Ltd., 3 Goodwin's Court, St. Martin's Lane, London, W.C.2
Leicester Square Bookshop, 28a Leicester Square, London, W.C.2
News Store, 10 Coptic Street, London, W.C.1
W. H. Smith & Son Ltd., Book Dept., Strand House, Portugal Street, London, W.C.2
Bowes & Bowes Ltd., 172 Trinity Street, Cambridge
Weatherhead's, Market Square, Cambridge
B. H. Blackwell Ltd., 48-51 Broad Street, Oxford
Haigh & Hochland, Oxford Road (nr. the University), Manchester
U.S.A.
Contemporary Press, 545 Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C. 17, New York
Contemporary Press, Box 82, Station A, Berkeley 2, California
Contemporary Press, P.O. Box 251, Cambridge 39, Mass.
Selected Outlets, 102 Beverly Road, Bloomfield, N.J., distributors throughout the U.S.A.

ARGENTINA

Mitchell's English Book Store, Cangallo 570, Buenos Aires

BELGIUM

Librairie du Nord, Bd. Adolphe Max 163, Bruxelles

CANADA

Lichtman's News Stand, 95 King Street W., Ontario
Toronto Labor Bookstore, 473½ Yonge Street, Toronto 5, Ontario
Metropolitan News Agency, 1248 Peel Street, Montreal, Quebec
Universal News Stand, 112E, Hastings Street, Vancouver, B.C.

EIRE

Eason & Son Ltd., 79-82 Middle Abbey Street, Dublin
Dublin Wholesale News Agency, 74 Middle Abbey Street, Dublin
Burns, Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 21-22 D'Olier Street, Dublin

FINLAND

Akteeminen Kirjakauppa, Helsinki

FRANCE

Galignani, 224 Rue de Rivoli, Paris Ier
Messageries Dawson, 4 Faubourg Poissonniere, Paris Xeme
Le Concorde, 240 Rue de Rivoli, Paris Ier

GERMANY

Gerhard Hänsel, Köln-Kalk, Victorstr., 16/18

HOLLAND

Meulenhoff & Co. N.V., Beulingstraat 2-4, Amsterdam-C.
N.V. Martinus Nijhoff's Boekhandel, Lange Voorhout 9, 's-Gravenhage

INDIA

Bhawan & Sons, Connaught Place, New Delhi

NORWAY

I. W. Cappelen, Kirkegt. 15, Oslo
Commermeyers Boghandel, Karl Johansgt. 41 & 43, Oslo

SOUTH AFRICA

Contemporary Press, P.O. Box 13, Johannesburg

TOGO LAND under U.K. TRUSTEESHIP

Contemporary Issues Agency, c/o P.O. Box 74, Hohoe

SWEDEN

A/B Sandbergs Bokhandel, Storgatan, 8, Stockholm
C. E. Fritz, Fredsgatan, 2, Stockholm

AUSTRALIA

E. F. G. Foreign Library, 28 Martin Place, Sydney, N.S.W.
University Bookshop, Hackett Hall, Crawley, W.A.

